

CONTENTS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION:		PAGE
AMERICA, INDIA AND THE WAR	By Sir Ranenwanti Mudaliar	205
BRITISH AUDIENCES AND INDIA	By Capt. K. K. Lalakka	205
ENGLISH NOVELS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY OF INDIA	By Mulk Raj Anand	244
INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY IN INDIA	By Iris Portal	258
AMERICA, BRITAIN AND INDIA	By Henry S. L. Potak	268
—————		—————
THE INDIAN POLITICAL SCENE	By H. G. Rawlinson	284
BARODA IN WAR-TIME: AT HOME AND ABROAD	By Stanley Rice	286
UNTOUCHABLE INDIA	By R. R. Bhole, M.L.A.	290
MY VISIT TO CHINA	By Lord Alwyn	297
VILLAGERS AT WAR: LIFE IN CHINA'S RURAL HOMES TO-DAY	By Dr. I. Highbaugh	301
THE ROYAL NETHERLANDS NAVY AND THE NETHERLANDS MERCHANT NAVY		308
JAPAN AT WAR	By H. Vere Redman	311
INDIAN STATES: CONSOLIDATION AND PROGRESS	By a Special Correspondent	316
THE NEW TURKEY	By Izzet-Mehli Devrim	320
THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST	By C. A. F. Dundas	325
FRENCH COLONIES IN 1943	By B. S. Townroe	328
A SUMMER HOLIDAY IN TURKEY IN 1942	By F. L. Billows	329
BOOK REVIEWS		331
POEM: THE WAY, THE TRUTH, THE LIFE	By John Kavanagh	334
CORRESPONDENCE		335

THE ASIATIC REVIEW

JULY, 1943

CHECKED

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION

AMERICA, INDIA AND THE WAR

by SIR RAMASWAMI MEDAHLAR, KCSI

The United States or America as it is popularly called is a continent in itself. Its physical features comprise almost all those characteristics that can be found anywhere in the world. Its climate varies from the sub-normal to the tropical. There are more races inhabiting this continent than in all Europe and certainly more creeds than in the older continent. And yet the United States is one country and the people form one nation. It would be a grave mistake to speak of a single American view or to suggest that there is one American opinion on any subject at any time.

It must be a lifelong study to understand the ways and habits, the thoughts and opinions of the people of so large an area and of so diverse a character. It will be a presumption bordering on stupidity to try and describe the views and opinions of Americans after a few weeks of stay in the country and after brief visits to only parts of it. I have laughed it and sometimes sympathized with the so called globe trotters who after a few months stay in India, visiting some of the bigger cities and getting into contact with particular sections of the community have attempted to write learned and sometimes voluminous books on India and its people.

I certainly do not wish to fall into the same error. I have had opportunities of visiting a few cities in what is called the Middle West of the United States. I have neither been to the South nor to the extreme West, and my knowledge is therefore very, very limited indeed. If I place before this audience what I conceive to be the views and opinions of some Americans with whom I have come into contact, it must clearly be understood that they are impressions gathered from a very small, almost microscopic, section of the community and that I am not trying to assess what American opinion or sentiment is on any question that I propose to deal with.

What is the attitude of some of these people in America towards India and Great Britain? India has always had an attraction to some sections of Americans. Its philosophy is studied at various universities. In most of the big cities there are groups of people who are engaged in seriously studying the religion of the Hindus. That great sage and saint Swami Vivekananda, who spoke at the Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1894 and spent some years in the country preaching Hindu religion and Hindu

philosophy, has left an indelible mark behind him, and the religious classes that he formed are continued to this day in such cities as New York, Chicago and San Francisco. There is, however, a wider interest in India and its problems today all over the continent, an interest in Indian politics and in the future of India. There are more books and pamphlets on India published in America today than perhaps in any other country outside India. There are more articles in newspapers, more contributions by that special class of writers, the columnists, who are a feature of American journalism, and more broadcasts on local wavelengths and continental hook-ups than at any other time in the past.

This great wave of interest in Indian politics and in the future of the country must be gratifying to any Indian. It has, however, been suggested by some that it is one of those phases of passing fancy which grip American imagination and interest for a time and then goes into oblivion when some other topic of great interest absorbs the American mind. There are various reasons why Americans should evince this intense and general interest in India at the present juncture. The ideals for which this war is being waged by the democracies, the principles which have been enunciated in the Atlantic Charter as a more precise definition of such ideals, an examination of the causes that lead to world wars and the domestic upheavals in India itself, have all contributed to the intensification of this interest.

AMERICAN VIEWS

What then is the American view about India and what does America propose to do? I have referred to the difficulty of generalizing about American opinion. There is no one definite opinion in America about India and its problems, and the motives which lead to the formation of such opinions are as varied as the opinions themselves. The views on India are sometimes the result of various extraneous factors which have no bearing on India and Indian problems. The opinions which some Americans entertain about Great Britain and the British people often colour their views about India. It is undeniable that there are sections of American people whose knowledge of past history begins, or at any rate has its firm foundation, in the American War of Independence. Their whole outlook on Great Britain is coloured by their memories of that war. They look upon the demand for Indian independence in the same way as they look upon the claims of their distant ancestors who threw tea chests into Boston harbour and fought for freedom. To this small section the Indian demand is logical, reasonable and indeed inevitable. They cannot understand why the demand was not made much earlier, or why it should not be conceded immediately.

From this group of idealists we can turn our attention to another group whose hostility, embittered hostility one might say, to the British has roots in causes less remote and more personal. This group, nurtured on Irish grievances of the last fifty years and vivifying its bitterness by the memory of events which are supposed to have occurred in Ireland during this period, feel and believe that India must go the way of the Irish Free State. These two sections are, however, small and do not represent the generality of the Americans whom I have come across. Their very extreme views,

their bitter partisanship and the hostility which they do not conceal towards Great Britain make it impossible for the average American to take them seriously. Neither can any sensible Indian derive any consolation or confidence from such views which are based, not on love for his country or real interest in his progress, but only on envenomed hostility to those who are supposed to be his masters.

There is another class of Americans whose views deserve greater consideration. There are those who feel that the two great wars of this century are the results of the hankering by some European Powers after colonial possessions and the power and prestige that come in the wake of such possessions. They feel that the theory of the master race has been propounded in order to justify the extension of sovereignty over areas to which the advocates of such a theory were not entitled. They feel that the people of these countries, Germany and Italy in particular, were brought under the influence of such Machiavellian theories only because the glittering prize of a colonial empire with all its supposed attractions, political and economic, was placed before them, and they believe that the era of war and perpetual strife can only disappear when the root cause—political greed—is removed. Imperialism in this sense is the root cause of all wars, and imperialism, wherever it exists, must disappear if the world is to be made safe for democracy and if this great war is to end all future wars.

From these premises they argue that countries like India must immediately have her own form of government, that colonial people must be enfranchised, and that if colonial people are not able to govern themselves immediately, a form of administration must be devised for them which must guarantee that at every stage the welfare of the colonial people is the first and last consideration of such administration. And as they consider it is humanly impossible for the dominant Power to be the impartial judge of the progress which these colonial people may make so as to fit them for administrative responsibility, they suggest that, though the administration of these colonies may be in the hands of the Power concerned for the time, it should still be subject to the supervision and perhaps guidance of other Powers not interested in perpetuating political domination over the colony. Sentiment as much as self-interest, or what they consider self-interest, is behind the attitude of this group of people.

UPHOLDERS OF BRITISH POLICY

Another section of people in the U.S.A., mainly those of the Anglo-Saxon race, who still feel a pride in their British ancestry, who try to trace back their roots into old British families and who try to maintain as far as possible British ways of thought and British habits and manners, take a different view of Indian or colonial problems. They are generally defenders of whatever Britain has done in the past. They are proud of the accomplishments of the British; they feel that the British are a race peculiarly gifted with the powers of colonization and they believe that British dominance in any part of the world has been to the good of the country and the people therein, and that it is best to leave the ordainment of such affairs in the hands of a people specially gifted to look after, if not to rule, races and people less developed in social or political consciousness.

Lastly—and this perhaps will come as a surprise—in the great democratic country of America there is a small section which is completely imperialist, which believes in empires and hopes for and lives in the vision of a day when the United States will have an empire of its own, when America may send prancing proconsuls to rule over parts of the earth which are less developed intellectually or physically and to which the great gifts of the American people may be brought. Visions of durbars, of state ceremonials, of splendid palaces, of glittering parades constantly hover before their eyes and are not supposed to be elusive and beyond their grasp.

Though I have described the views of various sections in America, we may, for all practical purposes, dismiss from serious consideration the extremes on either side and concentrate on that section which seriously believes that something has to be done in India to vindicate the very principles for which this war is being fought. This is the section which will have the largest influence in the country and which will shape the future policy of America in relation to a world order. Whether America will go back into isolationism and take that fatal turn again which it took in 1919, or whether it will line up with democracies in the confidence that it can establish a more equitable world order, a just peace and an era of progress, will depend largely on the influence of this section of American opinion.

SUGGESTED INTERVENTION

There was a time when some at least of the adherents of this view were anxious to intervene directly in the internal affairs of India and in the relationship between Great Britain and India and to decide on what may be done. This attitude was partly due to their belief in what they considered to be the fundamentals of the Atlantic Charter, and partly to the anxiety that they felt regarding India's position in this war and the way in which the fortunes of the war may be affected by the attitude of Indians. In the weeks following the almost unresisted and irresistible advance of the Japanese in the Pacific the thoughts of Western democracies were naturally directed to the position of colonies and dependencies in that area. India, with its vast population, its military strength, its productive capacity, actual and potential, its strategic position for defensive and offensive warfare, naturally dominated the consideration of the whole problem of the Far Eastern conflict. Stories of fifth columnist activities in the Malayan Archipelago, most of which have fortunately been since proved to be without foundation, led to the conception of an exaggerated picture of the dangers to a military campaign with a people discontented with and even actively hostile to the British. The security of American forces in India was supposed to be gravely in peril, and the wisdom of sending more troops and armaments to such a country was in some quarters seriously questioned. It is no wonder that a section of American opinion decided that the problem of India's constitutional future should be immediately solved and that American intervention was justified and necessary for its solution.

It has taken some time for these well-meaning critics to realize that both the premises and the proposed solution were entirely misconceived. As the months rolled by and the problem was seen in its proper perspective,

it became apparent that the over-simplified presentation of the problem and its equally facile solution were both very wide of the mark. The tendency of the average American is to apply the lessons and experiences of his own country and people to all nations and countries. America has solved the problem of racial minorities. It has overcome the difficulties arising from differences of race, language and religion. Americans are proud of the amalgam that by their policy they have been able to evolve out of extremely heterogeneous races and quite a babel of tongues.

An American writer says with truth: "One of the proudest boasts of American citizenship is that it is a 'melting-pot' of all Europe. The true American prides himself, not on his race, but on the fact that he is of no race, or that he represents an amalgam of all races." Racial feelings have been conquered and racial barriers broken down by this predominant characteristic which has been deliberately cultivated. I exclude the Negro question, which stands on a different footing and is not based on colour prejudice as is often supposed. The language problem has been solved in the same manner. English, or rather Americanese, is the only basic language taught in all schools. There is no encouragement to the claim of racial minorities to learn their mother-tongue to the exclusion of the American language. Those pretensions so often advanced that culture and language go together are entirely discounted, and all people are taught to believe in an American culture, in American traditions and in an American common future for all.

It is not difficult, therefore, to understand the American view of European politics, its disgust at the claims of a master race, its impatience at the problems of racial and linguistic minorities and its hope of a Federation of the United States of Europe. It is beyond the scope of this address to examine the American solution of the European problem. But it is relevant to observe that the Indian solution was at one stage not very different. Race, language and religion were to be of little or no account in such a solution. I believe there is a better grasp of the Indian problem today and a realization that no fanciful solutions of interventionists based on inadequate knowledge and limited experience will ever be accepted; in fact, that so far from offering a solution it may easily aggravate the situation and cause infinitely greater harm.

WIDER STUDY NEEDED

If direct intervention has been found impracticable, if it has been realized that a wider study of India and its problems is needed, if the basic facts of the political kaleidoscope are becoming clearer, it has not lessened American interest in India on ideological grounds. And that is a factor which has to be borne in mind and has not been sufficiently appreciated in this country. The American is a curious mixture of hard-headed businessman and a sentimentalist. The nation responds to a sentimental appeal. The four freedoms enunciated by the President are today the accepted creed of all America. The Atlantic Charter, to which the President and Prime Minister were parties, is as much acclaimed by the Republicans as by the Democrats. There is a strong urge among practically all sections to

build up a better post-war world which will ensure not merely peace but the healthy progress of humanity.

Republican leaders like Governor Stassen of Minnesota, Taft of Ohio, Wendell Willkie, Governor Stalleton and others, not to speak of ex-President Hoover and Governor Dewey, are either deeply committed to or tending towards the view that isolationism will deprive America as much as the world of the fruits of victory. The Democratic leaders are almost unanimous in following the lead of the President in this respect. They are whole-hearted in their support of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which incidentally it may be mentioned, is, according to American interpretation, applicable to all countries and all races irrespective of geographical or other limitations. Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under-Secretary of State, speaking in May, 1942, said: "If this war is in fact a war for the liberation of peoples it must assure the sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world as well as in the world of the Americas. Our victory must bring in its train the liberation of all peoples. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, creed or colour must be abolished. The age of imperialism is ended. The right of a people to their freedom must be recognized, as the civilized world long since recognized the right of an individual to his personal freedom. The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole—in all oceans and in all continents."

Vice-President Wallace, whose utterances on a post-war world strike a deep religious note, says: "Some have spoken of the 'American Century.' I say that the century on which we are entering—the century which will come out of this war—can be and must be the century of the common man. Perhaps it will be America's opportunity to suggest the freedoms and duties by which the common man must live. Everywhere the common man must learn to build his own industries with his own hands in a practical fashion. Everywhere the common man must learn to increase his productivity so that he and his children can eventually pay to the world community all that they have received. No nation will have the God-given right to exploit other nations. Older nations will have the privilege to help younger nations get started on the path to industrialization, but there must be neither military nor economic imperialism. The methods of the nineteenth century will not work in the peoples' century which is now about to begin. India, China and Latin America have a tremendous stake in the peoples' century."

These and other speeches of leading statesmen in America clearly indicate that in post-war talks they are not likely to disinterest themselves in the affairs of India. The problem is to give them the opportunity to do so without in any way making them direct interventionists, or much less arbitrators, either between Britain and India or among the political parties in India itself.

AMERICAN COLLABORATION

It is generally accepted that the collaboration of America in post-war reconstruction is eminently desirable and that a policy of isolationism will not benefit the world and will do harm to America. But the American

feels that there can be more than one kind of isolationism, and while he condemns the superficially selfish isolationism which believes the safest course for America is to draw into its shell after the war is won, he is equally condemnatory of what he terms provocative isolationism, which says, "Hands off our affairs and our relations with other parts of our empire, as we know best how to manage them."

Speaking of India and its problems it is possible to have a synthesis of these conflicting viewpoints. The framing of the constitution must be the task of the Indian politician. The ultimate adjustments between a self-governing India and Great Britain must be a matter of adjustment between the two Governments. But there seems to be no great obstacle to an invitation being extended to a select band of experts from the United States, Canada and Australia to advise those engaged on the task of framing a constitution on specific points of constitution or administration which may be referred to them. After all, constitution acts are merely the husk, and little guidance can be derived from poring over sections of such acts. The real kernel is in the knowledge of how these acts are worked in actual practice, how they are made to adapt to varied and ever-varying circumstances. When all the din and dust of controversy subside in Indian politics and leaders settle down to a consideration of the constitutional machinery, I have no doubt their thoughts will turn to ideas of a Federation or a Confederation. The three great countries which have worked successfully Federal constitutions are the United States, Canada and Australia. The experience of their constitutional and administrative experts would be invaluable, and while giving America, Canada and Australia an opportunity of helping in reconstruction, it may prove a blessing to those engaged in solving the perplexities which abound in the Indian problem.

INDIA AND BRITAIN

The position of a self-governing, autonomous India in relation to the British Commonwealth has caused some speculation in American minds. It is too easily assumed, and by some in this country as well, that an autonomous India is bound to cut adrift from the amity of nations represented by the British Commonwealth. Differences of race and religion preclude, it is suggested, the forging of that link which binds the present self-governing dominions to the United Kingdom. A survey of the position in the various Dominions will show how fallacious the assumption is, and reveal that perhaps people separated by race and language are sometimes even more anxious to preserve the link than those who claim the same origin, speak the same language and practise the same creed.

Notwithstanding all the statements of politicians that can be cited, I believe that an overwhelming majority of my countrymen have no desire to secede from the Commonwealth. Past traditions, memories and interests, as much as enlightened self-interest, dictate such an attitude. While India will be prepared to support fully and unreservedly any global institution for world security and does not believe in isolationism or in Austinian theories of sovereignty for any country, it realizes that an organization twice tested during the last generation in the great world wars should not be disrupted; that, in fact, it is better to maintain the

security of a tried federation even while hoping that the new institution may prove equally efficient.

And, indeed, an Indo-British Commonwealth of Nations will add to and not detract from the utility of a global institution for world security and peace on earth. Nor will its ambitions be thwarted or restricted by such an equal partnership freely recognized. For I believe that the time has come when an advance is inevitable over the virtual independence which Dominions now enjoy through the Statute of Westminster. I believe that in matters of foreign policy and defence an integral Council of Dominions and the United Kingdom is becoming clearly necessary. And India, having the same status as any Dominion, will be in a position to play a worthy part, benefiting and being benefited by this great association of free nations.

"Our times are in His hand
Who saith, 'A whole I planned;
Youth shows but half; trust God,
See all, nor be afraid.'"

DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER

At a meeting of the Association held on Tuesday, April 6, 1943, at the Caxton Hall, S.W. 1, the Hon. Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, K.C.S.I., lectured on "America, India and the War." The Right Hon. Sir Hugh O'Neill, P.C., M.P., presided.

The CHAIRMAN said it gave him great pleasure to introduce Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, but he did not really require introduction to such an audience, since many of those present were his personal friends. Sir Ramaswami was a representative of India at the War Cabinet, and there would not be any difference of opinion when he said that his record of past services both in India and in this country eminently fitted him for the post he now occupied. Sir Ramaswami had a great knowledge of Indian politics and also of this country: he was at the India Office for three or four years, first of all as a member of the Council and after the 1935 Act came into operation as one of the Advisers to the Secretary of State. He personally regretted that Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar went to India to take up a post in the Viceroy's Executive Council only a short time before he (the Chairman) became Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State and thus was deprived of the pleasure of meeting him when he was in the India Office.

The subject on which Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar was to speak was of great importance and interest at the present time. He had quite recently been in Canada for the Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations and had also visited the United States, so that, quite apart from the general background of his knowledge of Indian and Imperial questions, he had been in close contact with the particular subject on which he was to address the meeting.

Sir RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR then delivered his lecture.

The CHAIRMAN said that Sir Ramaswami had given a brilliant and statesmanlike address on a subject of great importance on which he would make one or two comments. The United States was such a vast country, its people were so diverse, that it was not strange that there were many who took an interest in India. What was

almost more vital was that if they took an interest in India their knowledge of India should be correct. There had in the past been too much of only one Indian point of view put before the American people—that of the Congress. He could not help feeling that the recent visit of Sir Ramaswami to the United States must have had a tremendous effect in bringing home to the American people a correct perspective of the Indian situation.

He was very much impressed when Sir Ramaswami spoke of the frank manner in which he had addressed the Americans, how he told them that in many respects he did not think they knew enough about the Indian problem to be able to solve it, and his words would carry great weight with them. Those who had some knowledge in their different spheres of the Indian problem knew how difficult the solution was, and how essential it was that not one but many phases and aspects of Indian life and politics should be present in the minds of those who attempted to find a solution of that problem.

Sir Ramaswami made one very interesting statement towards the end of his remarks when he said—and the speaker felt sure that he was correct—that the general view in the United States was that they were coming to realize that they could not take any direct part in solving the Indian political problem. How could they? He did not suppose that they wished to do so. Sir Ramaswami also put forward an interesting suggestion when he said that he thought there might be some arrangement under which a standing panel of American, Australian and Canadian advisers might be set up, each with his own particular knowledge of the federation which he would represent. It might be upon some such lines as this that American participation in an Indian settlement might eventually be reached. But the people primarily who would have to solve this problem were the people of the United Kingdom and of the whole of the British Empire together with the Indian people. It must be remembered that the Indian people were composed of many sections—two great communities, Hindu and Muslim, the Indian Princes, and various minorities—and all these should play a part in the solution which was bound to come, and the sooner it came the better for everyone concerned.

Major YEATS-BROWN said that Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar had left him with a most enthusiastic feeling of the good he must have done in the United States. The remark which moved him most was Sir Ramaswami's allusion to the generation to which neither he nor the speaker belonged—the younger generation—and their determination to see a solution to this problem. It was a common saying that a lecturer on India was able to empty the smallest lecture hall in a university town, probably because many speakers made the whole problem so difficult; they said so much about divergences of opinion and difficulties that the audience felt that they were insoluble. But that was not the impression Sir Ramaswami gave. When he went to the United States he told the Americans that something could and would be done by the younger generation. He himself was an old Indian Army officer, and the younger generation in India was very largely in the Army. He did not know the exact size of the Indian Army, but it was about 1,500,000 strong, and was the greatest body of volunteers ever seen in the history of the world. These young men would undoubtedly play their part in shaping the future of India.

He had heard many lecturers on the subject of India, but he had never heard the position and its future possibilities so clearly and so forcefully stated as he had by Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar. He felt that the audience owed him a great debt of gratitude.

Miss RACHEL PARSONS said that her reason for speaking was that she had spent many years in the United States and heard a great deal of criticism of our administration in India. This criticism was very largely based upon ignorance, but she also thought much of our criticism of the United States was based upon ignorance. The Americans talked about our Empire, but we did not talk to them about their Empire. There was a serious Indian problem in the United States—the Indians in the reservations. Then there was the negro problem, which was very serious; 10 per cent. of the population of the United States were negroes; a fact which she remembered when

Mr. Sumner Welles spoke recently of equality of race. The negroes might be legally equal but they were not practically equal.

Sir PHILIP HARTOG said that he had never heard a more admirable exposition of facts than they had heard that day. They would leave that room different people from those who entered. He had always wondered at the ignorance of the United States regarding India—an ignorance which could only be matched by the ignorance in England. He wished to express his gratitude, which he felt sure was shared by everyone present, for the enlightening and inspiring address of Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar.

Sir HASSAN SUHRAWARDY said they had heard much about the ignorance of America, but at last it was refreshing to note that Sir Philip Hartog had referred to the ignorance in England. On one aspect of the Indian problem, at least, both the Americans and British were ignorant, and that was the point of view of the great Muslim community.

Sir Ramaswami had pointed out that the United States of America consisted not only of the descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers, but of all the nationals of Europe; they had become one and spoke one common language, American English, with one common ideal, as a united nation. He had also explained in vivid terms how the Dominions of Canada, Australia and South Africa had come into being. The Chairman came from Northern Ireland; Ireland had had its troubles which were now settled ("Oh!"), and the Irish people had a great deal of sympathy, as had the Americans, with the Indian aspiration for freedom. Sir Ramaswami had pointed out correctly, 95 per cent. of the people of India did not wish to secede, but they wished to be free in the sense that they wished to stand up with self-respect amongst the community of nations. They did not wish to be held down. Miss Rachel Parsons had spoken about American ignorance and their colour prejudice and negro problem—these would not apply to India. The Indians of Asia were not negroes, they were not descendants of those unfortunate human chattels whom Europeans transported from one place to another. The Indians were descended from the people who had a great ancient civilization and culture and who were clad in the finest of fabrics when the British people were painting their skins! A nation with that background and culture could not be held down simply by the power of the bayonet and machine-gun.

Several speakers had said, and Sir Ramaswami thought, that America was not qualified to take part in the actual settlement of the Indian problem. In his opinion it was a domestic quarrel; let it be settled by the common people of the great British nation. He had been here throughout the Blitz period and had seen the greatness of this nation, its endurance and courage, and he had seen how one reverse after another had left them undaunted with their chins up—Narvik, Dunkirk, Crete, the North African desert—they had set an example and given a lead to the United Nations of what faith could endure and courage achieve. The common people were giving their lives for the ideals set out in the Atlantic Charter, and they were saying, Could not India be given freedom? Could not the spiritual values for which they were fighting be shared by India? When there was a fight between a small boy and a big giant it was necessary to have public opinion, and it was the public opinion of the United Nations which was watching to see how this settlement was brought about by Great Britain.

When India's problem was settled, would it be settled as a finished, united India? or would it be carried out by stages, as in the two great Dominions of Canada and Australia? Separate Dominions and then a union of the whole country? That was the crux of the matter, because there they had to give way to the will of the common people.

He would ask Sir Ramaswami, with his great experience of India and other peoples, who was the tiller of the land, who was the under-dog, who were the common people? Which party had unjust power in India, who were the money-lenders, the owners of mills, and who were the influential members in the machinery of government, and on what basis? Were they not going to do something to bring

Indians together so that people could live as self-respecting neighbours, with respect of their culture and tradition, secured so that they might become a united nation? There was no trouble between the North and South of Ireland today ("Oh!"); at least, there was some remnant of bitterness perhaps, because the settlement was so recent. There was the same trouble in South Africa, but they were together today, and a lesson should be taken from these experiences. It was true that nobody could understand the greatness of the British people unless they had travelled throughout the world. He had travelled from coast to coast in America and had met the common people and had appreciated their interest in things outside their own sphere. Had Sir Ramaswami, travelling under Government auspices, been able to meet the common people?

In conclusion, the speaker asked Sir Ramaswami to do justice to the great Muslim community in India, which wanted to have security for their self-expression and to live side by side as brothers and neighbours and not to be submerged.

Sir FREDERICK SYKES congratulated Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar on his masterly and opportune address, and at the same time thanked Sir Hugh O'Neill for presiding. Sir Ramaswami's visit to America was a useful experience not only for himself but for his American hosts, and it would be a good thing if other Indian statesmen of ripe experience could go to that country and explain the true nature of the situation. Sir Ramaswami modestly stated that he could not write a book on the country, as he was only there a few weeks; what a contrast to some writers on India who rushed into print, often without going there at all! Sir Ramaswami had said that the settlement of the Indian question lay in the hands of the younger generation. That was a profound truth. Perhaps one good result which might arise from the blood and sweat of this terrible war would be the birth of a new world for India as well as Europe. English, Americans and Indians had fought shoulder to shoulder, and from the comradeship born in the battlefield there might arise a fresh spirit of understanding and toleration, which was the first essential to a political settlement.

Sir RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR, in acknowledgment, said he was overwhelmed by the kind expressions of all the speakers and especially of Sir Frederick Sykes. He assured Sir Hassan Suhrawardy that his contacts with the American people had been low down in the social scale. His trip to the United States was an effort on his own part and he did not go as a Government representative, either of His Majesty's Government or of India. The opinions he expressed could never have been made if he had been a representative of any Government. It was only because they were personal views that the American audiences accepted him. On behalf of the Chairman and himself he thanked the audience for their kind expressions.

BRITISH AUDIENCES AND INDIA

BY CAPTAIN K. K. LALKARA

(The Wiltshire Regiment)

WHEN in the spring of 1940 I came back to London from India to enlist in the Army as a private, the recruiting officer asked me where in Great Britain would I first like to be sent. My reply was: "I have already travelled more than 6,500 miles to do this job, and so another two or three hundred miles in any direction is a mere detail. Send me where I could be most useful; anywhere from Land's End to John o'Groats." Little did I know then how significant was that last sentence, that within ten months from the time those words were uttered I should be called upon to undertake a job

which, for the last two years, has kept me continuously travelling from Land's End to John o'Groats—and even beyond. On five nights in the week I sleep in a different place; virtually my headquarters is my service cap.

This is not the time or the place to recount in detail my experiences in the ranks of a famous Scottish regiment, but I may admit that from the very first day I was a nightmare to our regimental quartermaster and sergeant-major. Despite all their efforts to make a smart soldier of me, I never rose to any dizzy heights beyond alternating between sentry-go duty, largely in dark, dank and damp pill-boxes in the heathery wilds of Scottish moorlands, and scrubbing floors and dixies or peeling potatoes in the cookhouse.

I should have been very sorry to miss that great experience of ten months. It gave me an insight into human nature as nothing else had done. On the whole my comrades were a tough lot—very tough—but equally stout and large-hearted. And they did for me far more by enriching my life with colourful experiences than anything I could ever expect to do for them in return. In those ten months I learnt many things which qualified me the better for my present job of giving talks to the Forces on India and the British Empire. For one thing, I learnt to think their thoughts and even to speak their language, and thus to win their complete confidence and understanding. Paradoxical though it may seem, thereby I broadened my own outlook on life.

All these years I thought I knew a smattering of King's English. But not till I heard it spoken in the barrack-room did I realize the rich and fruitful possibilities of which it was capable! Of course, in my present work I do not tell them that, nor do I let them know what I know of it.

VARIED AUDIENCES

Just over two years ago I obtained my commission, and I have since been employed as a travelling lecturer from the War Office. In this work there is not a county in Great Britain that I have not visited, and my duties have even taken me beyond the statutory limits of the British Isles. I travel under all sorts of conditions: on foot, by rail and road, by sea and in the air. The only two modes of conveyance I have not yet been called upon to use are a scooter and a submarine! By now I must have lectured to over 350,000 members of the Forces, of all ranks and ages and of both sexes.

Sometimes my audience may be composed solely of officers gathered together in the large ante-room of an officers' mess. At other times there may be a few N.C.O.s and men gathered round a vertical stove inside a Nissen hut. But as a rule at these lectures I have a mixed audience drawn from all ranks, and very often both sexes. I have spoken to them in their dining halls, in garrison theatres, at gun sites and on sand dunes, and at times surrounded by heavy implements of war and destruction. Yes, even on aerodromes and inside large hangars with planes roaring at not too great a distance, though usually our own planes. There have been a very few occasions when the enemy has shown a rude desire to gate-crash from above. Of course, we have strongly resented such bad manners. But on each such occasion, after we have told him in an unambiguous manner what we think of him, we have carried on as if there had been no interruption. No less than in seven different places Hitler has tried to get me, and each time has failed. Once he left me with only one khaki shirt, which I had to keep on my back longer than I care to remember.

Now I should relate what I tell my audiences and how. First, by the help of a map I get them to realize the size of India and compare it with the size of their island home and the continent of Europe. All this must be done by stages and in terms my listeners can easily visualize. I am convinced that little useful purpose is served by giving a talk on India and her problems without first constructing before the eyes of listeners—step by step—the geographical, physical and historical background of so vast and ancient a land. But time is a big consideration. One is always compelled to run a race against it. Great condensation is necessary, and this is achieved by little subtle devices which come to my mind every now and then. For example, if I have a large-sized folding map of India with me, I stick on it prominently a halfpenny stamp, which at once catches the eye of the audience, and they begin to wonder for

what purpose it is there. Having let them guess for a while, I turn to it and tell them that that is how their largest county—Yorkshire—would look in relation to India. The trick is done and my object achieved. Where I have not the facility to exhibit this particular map I resort to other devices.

THE THEME

I assure you this is very much of a full-time job. To achieve best results, not only must I keep abreast of all current events, but also constantly revolve in my mind fresh ideas and new ways of expressing them. The manner of delivery also always varies, governed largely by a chain of circumstances not always predictable. Hence the greater necessity not to talk at, or talk to, my audiences, but to talk *with* them. Having built up my background, I tell them what India is doing in this war as much as of what Britain has done for India. Her political problems also are briefly dealt with. Let me summarize for your benefit the burden of my theme under a few headings :

- (1) To be able to understand India and her problems it must be thought of in the broad and large terms of a continent and never the small terms of a country, because India is nothing if not a land of great contrast, colour and paradox.
- (2) India is not one nation, but a conglomeration of peoples of various races and creeds, and this phenomenon of welding a vast, heterogeneous mass into one homogeneous whole is entirely a British achievement.
- (3) As 90 per cent. of her population is politically unconscious, there is the more reason to think of India less in terms of abstract politics and more in terms of geography and climate, race and religion, history and concrete achievement, and, above all, in terms of human values and relationships, which alone seem to give meaning and significance to life itself.
- (4) The story of our Indian Empire is the story of the lives of men and women of that small but happy breed of your own race who had the courage, the vision and the larger faith to dedicate their lives in the service of other people, for which they have deserved well of Britain as well as India. All of them did not go out as missionaries or altruists. A few even fell by the wayside, yet many more were able to stay the course. But there was this to it : No matter what impulse took them to India and years of self-imposed exile, whenever a job had to be done these fine people never took any reckoning of the cost, even though the final reckoning cost them their lives. They could not have done this had they not believed in themselves and in the imperial destiny of their race, and also had not their own conception of Empire been in consonance with revealed truth as they had heard it.

Not so long ago I was faced with the task of addressing a famous military school. Of the audience of 375, more than 200 were little boys between the ages of eight and twelve. The 60 adults included the commandant of the school and practically all the members of the teaching and administrative staff. The rest were senior boys. I was expected to put across to them India in half an hour with a talk that would hold the interest of all of them. Fortunately, with Divine guidance, Kipling's help and my own audacity, I just managed to pull it off. You should have seen those youngsters, and even the elders, getting up in quick succession and pelting me with all sorts of intelligent and interesting questions. One small boy, much to the amusement of all, even asked me whether I had ever been chased by a crocodile or seen anyone else in a similar predicament. And this was by no means his first or only question. There was no stopping the inquirers.

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

The attitude of my audiences towards India is sympathetic to the hope of seeing her a Dominion in the near future, equal in status to the other British Dominions. Their sympathy would prove more helpful if it arose from an elementary knowledge of facts. But I have found little evidence of that, and it is this deficiency which is largely responsible for the present generation of Britons having grown up without sufficient sober pride in the imperial achievements of their people and in their im-

perial inheritance. Mr. Arthur Bryant recently observed that the young people of our day are politically conscious, but they lack that necessary sense of political responsibility. Mr. G. M. Young, about the same time, stated in a vigorous declaration that in the last thirty years the minds of young Britons have been filled with wind and fed on very little substance. Unfortunately, these indictments are only too true. My experience in my present work shows that in the matter of imperial geography and history the school education of the modern Briton has been sadly neglected.

You will see what immense scope there is, not merely for one talk, but for a long series of talks just under those four headings. Wisely handled, I find these points always stimulate my audiences to reorientate their ideas and make a new approach to this most intriguing, most fascinating of subjects.

Next I must tell you how my audiences react to these talks. Well, there is something about the subject itself which cannot fail to grip their attention. And by being a little provocative in some of my remarks I have invariably succeeded in stimulating their interest, which shows itself during the discussion period, when there is always a burst of questions.

A short time ago, during a railway journey in Cornwall, I met a young Englishwoman. She was a very interesting conversationalist. She told me she was a graduate of one of the British universities and that for her degree she had read "human geography" and history. She further emphasized the point that it was a great mistake to separate the two if one was to have a balanced judgment on affairs of nations. And yet when it came to geography and the history of Britain and the British Empire, I regret to say, she betrayed abysmal ignorance. This otherwise interesting and intelligent woman had turned herself into a mouthpiece of uninformed propaganda. She is by no means a solitary example. I meet such people in large numbers every day, not only in the forces, but in railway trains, in trams and buses and in the lounges of hotels.

This is not the occasion for me to outline proposals for the remedying of so regrettable a defect. I have drawn the attention of responsible people to the danger arising therefrom in a memorandum circulated privately a few weeks ago. Further, Service traditions preclude me from entering into public controversy so long as I wear my uniform. But that does not mean that I am not alive to the danger or do not feel acutely about it. Moreover, it makes me very happy to be able to tell you that the Army Bureau of Current Affairs has taken the question in hand so far as members of His Majesty's Forces are concerned. Should their present wise policy be pursued, and if ardent idealism is chaperoned by staid and sober realism, much good will ensue.

I wish some of you who are not trammelled by Service regulations and restrictions had my opportunity to see and hear for yourselves the things I have spoken of. Then you could tell your friends in India that so far as their political aspirations go they have only to close their own ranks, practise the virtues of give-and-take and live-and-let-live, and British public opinion will be the first to demand that the Indian Dominion should be a *fait accompli* at the earliest possible date. My job is to remind the British people that political India and the India of the peasants, the factory workers, the great Princes and the magnificent soldiery are two different things; that the great Indian caravan moves on silently and in majesty despite all the noise and commotion of the discontented.

Is there anything that each and all of us—no matter where we are or what our life's work—can do together? Yes. Let us first of all cease thinking in "isms," whether these be political, economic or social. Let us recapture the art of living, which consists of not what we get out of life, but of what we put into it. Is not that the one outstanding moral of the story I go telling up and down Britain—the story of the great Indian Empire? The great fact which has already gone down in history is that British achievement and inheritance—like British traditions—are founded and built on sheer force of character. These last twenty-five years we seem to have overlooked that until the inexorable march of events caught up with us.

You will, I feel sure, heartily agree with me that to make the youth of Britain aware of this is a task worth the doing. Singularly fortunate are those to whom is given the opportunity of doing it.

DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER

A MEETING of the Association was held on Thursday, March 25, 1943, at the Caxton Hall, Caxton Street, S.W.1, when Captain K. K. Lalkaka read a paper entitled "British Audiences and India." Lord Erskine, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.S., presided.

The CHAIRMAN said that Captain Lalkaka was no stranger to the meetings of the East India Association. When he came to this country eight years ago he was already a member and took an active part in the discussions from the standpoint of a staunch friend and believer in the British connection with India. When the European situation darkened and the clouds of war were gathering he sought to serve the Empire by applying to be placed on the list of the Reserve of Officers, but he was informed that his application could not be entertained as the regulations forbade recruitment in this country of persons not of European birth. He was deeply grieved by this refusal, and it was at his instance that the Council of the Association took up the question of this ancient and entirely unjustifiable embargo. In the early summer of 1939 the Council made a detailed representation to the Secretary of State, asking him to take the question up with the Service Departments and urging that since voluntary recruitment was open to all in India there was no justification for exclusion in this country on grounds of race. The question was under discussion when the war broke out, and the Council made a further representation. Happily, and as was to be expected, it had the strong support of Lord Zetland, who was then Secretary of State for India, and very soon the restriction was withdrawn, nominally for the period of the war, but he thought it was certain that it had in fact disappeared for ever.

Meanwhile, Captain Lalkaka returned with his family to Bombay and then came back to this country in the spring of 1940. He enlisted in the Army, being posted to one of the famous Scottish regiments. After some months in the ranks he was selected to be a travelling lecturer for the Education Branch of the War Office, chiefly to speak to the troops on India.

The abandonment of the race restriction had opened the door to recruitment in this country of many young Indians and Anglo-Indians, including a number of officers in the Royal Air Force.

Captain Lalkaka then read his paper.

The CHAIRMAN said that Captain Lalkaka was doing a great work in putting forward his views on the Indian Empire to English audiences, and particularly to Army audiences. The authorities at the War Office should be congratulated in that they had realized that this was a golden opportunity to educate the youth of this country regarding the true facts about India. There were in the Army today representatives of all sections of the population and the present opportunity to inculcate true lessons concerning India would never recur.

Many of those present had no doubt attempted in their own way to put the facts concerning the India Empire before English audiences. He himself since his return from India had done something in that direction, but he did not pretend to have spoken to anything like the number of people to which the lecturer had owned. Those who lectured realized that the British public was extremely anxious to know the facts. The East India Association was originally formed to educate the British people on India, and for seventy-five years it had carried out this task with a considerable amount of success. There was no doubt, however, that very much more education was required if the British people were really to understand India. He found that his audiences were most anxious to learn and a flood of questions was always put after the lecture. The main feature which had struck him in lecturing on India had been that the English people did not seem to be able to envisage the great size of India or its diversities of race and religion. They were apt to think of it as a country like Great Britain, and he thought that Captain Lalkaka's suggestion of using a halfpenny stamp to represent Yorkshire was a good one, and one which he would adopt in any future addresses he might give.

There were also in this country a growing number of American troops, and it was

just as important to attempt to give them some idea of the Indian Empire as it was to educate our own people. He found they asked questions such as: "We were able to give the Philippines self-government; why is it not possible to give India self-government immediately?" They did not seem to realize the vast differences between the two countries.

He (Lord Erskine) thought the elementary facts about India should be put before the public and the troops. He found it was difficult for the ordinary English private soldier to understand that the caste system had created a social organization, and, indeed, a civilization entirely different from anything which we knew in the West. They did not realize that India was divided into hundreds of different races, and when they were told that in the Madras Presidency alone there were five different nationalities, speaking quite different languages, it gave them an entirely new outlook on the problem.

He did not pretend to know much about the north of India; he always told his hearers that his experience was in the south and that it was useless to ask him about the north, for north and south India were more distinct from each other than were Portugal and Poland. The only unit with which the Indian Empire could be compared was the ancient Empire of Rome; audiences should be asked if they realized that Rome ruled over all Europe, except Germany, and also over those great territories which stretched to the east and south of the Mediterranean Sea. As long as the power of Rome remained strong her Empire formed a cohesive whole and peace reigned within its borders; but as soon as the Roman military power became weak the Empire split up into its separate parts, from whence sprang the nations of Europe as we know them today. He also pointed out that it was unfortunately true that ever since the break-up of Rome the individual nations which formed it had done nothing but fight and bicker! He asked his audiences if they wished to envisage a similar future for India, or whether they thought that it was not important to retain the present unity of the sub-continent.

The more that could be done to educate the electorate regarding the fundamental truths of India the better. It should be stated at the same time that our goal was dominion status, not only for India, but, indeed, for all our Colonies; that we were the first great imperial race which had conceived this ideal of self-government for all the component parts of our Commonwealth; that all the white Dominions were now entirely independent and were merely held together by the thin gossamer thread of allegiance to the Crown, and although other nations might think that link weak, yet in two great wars it had been found to be stronger than steel.

The problem of the white Dominions had been solved: we had now to find the answer to an even more difficult question—how to keep within the British Empire, contented and self-governing, those portions of the globe under the Union Jack whose populations did not belong to the same race as ourselves. For the last twenty or thirty years attempts had been made by trial and error, with, perhaps, a good many errors; but nevertheless the true goal was well known. It was that the British Empire should remain united under the Crown and that its component parts should be self-governing.

Perhaps, said Lord Erskine, his remarks had strayed rather far from the actual title of the lecture, but they were, he thought, germane to the subject. He hoped that all in the audience who knew India would realize that those who had been privileged to serve that great country had a duty to explain to their fellow-countrymen the real facts about the Indian Empire. The people wanted to know the truth and to do the right thing, but at the moment they were too ignorant to know what the right thing was. It was the mission in life of those who knew to explain to the British electorate the truth about India and the best way to proceed. No doubt they would each have their own ideas as to this, but nevertheless they could give the public the facts. India was not a subject which could be learnt out of books. When he went to Madras in 1934 he did not know very much about India; he tried to read it up but soon found that he knew little. It took him some years to understand what was really happening, and by the end of his period of office as Governor he thought he knew something about the problem and he proposed to spread that knowledge among the population whenever possible, although he realized that he could speak only of south India.

In conclusion, the Chairman expressed his personal gratitude to Captain Lalkaka for his most interesting address; he realized what splendid work he was doing in bringing home to the young soldiers of this country the true facts about his ancient and celebrated country.

Lady HARTOG said that her own experience was on a very much smaller scale than that of Captain Lalkaka, being mainly with women's audiences, but there was the same fundamental difficulty—the prevailing ignorance about India. She found that the mind of the average audience to whom she was asked to speak was a blank slate, and the lecturer could write on it what he would in the time allotted. It was easy to be tempted to write as much as possible, but if the t's were not crossed nor the i's dotted what was written might be a confused blur. The best way was to speak very shortly and to leave the greater part of the time for questions and to answer them more fully than one would do at an ordinary lecture.

Except at women's institutes, the great demand at the present time was for talks on the political situation. The deadlock in India and the doubts regarding India's position in the war had aroused very wide interest, but talks about the political situation were amongst the most difficult because of the lack of time for giving the background of fact. How was one to give a clear picture in half an hour or forty-five minutes? It was very rare to have the chance of giving more than one talk to the same audience.

Just because of the lack of background the audience was peculiarly susceptible to any kind of propaganda which might be offered to it. She felt that the period of indifference regarding India was passing, but the period of ignorance still remained. It would remain until there was more teaching in the schools about the countries of the Commonwealth. Meanwhile they had to do the best they could with adult education, and it was a sign of the very great interest in India at the present time that fifty or more people were giving up their Saturday afternoons to attend a series of ten lectures which had been arranged at the City Literary Institute. All the time, trouble and effort one could give in trying to spread better knowledge and understanding about India was worth while.

Mr. ENWIN HAWARD said that the Chairman had mentioned American views on India, but he thought that unless we removed the beam from our own eyes we could hardly be surprised if people showed ignorance of the kind which had been criticized. They did not have a blank slate on which to write; various conditions, some of them passing, some of fairly long standing, had developed in this country a section of opinion which was endeavouring not so much to spread information about India as to vilify whatever had been done in India, whether by ourselves or by Indians in comradeship with us. He thought Lady Hartog was correct in saying that people were anxious to know more. It was the responsibility of the electorate to get to know the political situation. In the 'twenties there was in the universities and schools a cult which was almost shamed at our having anything to do with colonization or British achievement in India. They should get down, not so much to the question of educating the general public, but to see that the sources of information from which the public drew its knowledge were not tainted.

Mr. WARIS AMPER ALI said that Captain Lalkaka was the first Indian, so far as he was aware, to apply to join H.M. Forces in Great Britain before even the time of the Munich crisis. He met with a refusal, as had been mentioned; but later, after he had taken his family back to India, he returned, and after a little difficulty joined a famous Scottish regiment. They found he was 51 inches round the chest and there was no uniform to fit him. He came to London and purchased the private's uniform, including the trews, at Moss Bros. about six weeks later. He was in the ranks for a considerable time, and on the night he left to take up his commission his C.O. and officers dined him in mess as a private and the next day his captain paraded his company under the Union Jack to wish him "God speed." He now regarded the officers' mess of this regiment as his home in England.

When the Cabinet announcement of October, 1939, permitting the innovation of

the entry of persons of non-European birth into the British Armed Forces was made, it was a long time before it percolated into the units. All wondered how it would work; there were young men resident in this country of pure Indian birth who had never seen India and who were liable for conscription. There were now a considerable number of Indian officers and men in all three services, and by the kind and sympathetic treatment of all concerned it might now be said that the experiment had succeeded. A tribute was due to the men themselves, but it was also worthily due to their British officers and comrades in the ranks. Where possible it was better that the young Indian should join the Forces on his own rather than with other Indians, and stand on his own feet with Britons of the same standing and age. There had been very few failures indeed and they could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

It was hoped that, now this experiment was well under way, the authorities would continue it when the war finished and that the survivors would bring their sense of discipline, common sense and courage to the service of the Crown and the Indian Empire in civil life just as in war.

Mr. COWASJEE JEHANGIR said he had been speaking to audiences on India for nearly nine months, mostly in the north of England. All were deeply interested in India, but through complete ignorance many regarded the Indians as a strange and remote people. Many others knew only what they learnt from the widely organized Congress propaganda. They had no realization of the numerous groups forming India and who wished for Indian independence, but not by any means Congress rule.

He himself was neither a Hindu nor Muslim, but a Parsee, and belonged to one of the minorities, of which there were many. There was no truth in the assertion that Congress alone was the voice of India, and it was sad to think that so many of the British people were still misguided into believing that India was one vast Congress camp; no greater fabrication existed in modern history.

India's gigantic war effort had been overshadowed at times by the foolish policy of non-violence. In spite of the civil disobedience movement last autumn, 70,000 men monthly enrolled in the Army voluntarily. Men and women in India were doing their best in every branch of war work, and why? Because they realized that the safety and victory of the United Nations was the only sure guarantee for the existence and security of India.

One question which he was frequently asked by the man in the street was: "Would the Indian problem be solved by the British quitting India?" His answer was always that the great bulk of the people were not responsible for nor in sympathy with the "quit India" campaign. Congress must answer its own conscience for the good or harm it had done to India by its policy; there must be a unity in face of the common enemy of such combined strength that the front could never be broken. With the coming of peace India would take her proper place with the other United Nations, always within the British Empire.

Sir LIONEL HAWORTH said that Captain Lalkaka was doing work of which many of them were incapable—he was getting to the man in the ranks. He (Sir Lionel) was too old to enlist and had taken to visiting bars in order to get in touch with the people and hear what they had to say. He was amazed at the ignorance which existed and at the extraordinary effect which the Leftist propaganda had had. These were the people they wanted to reach, they were the voters, and Captain Lalkaka was touching the people whom it was necessary to touch, who had been caught by Leftist propaganda.

Another question which had been raised was that of America. One was afraid of offending Americans, although they were not afraid of offending the British. No American seemed to know his own history; the United States was the finest example of an empire which could be found. Ninety per cent. of the American War of Independence was due to the British Government refusing to allow the Americans to cross the mountains in order to take over country which did not belong to them and which the British Government wished to leave as a Red Indian reserve. President Jackson brought in an ordinance whereby the Indians were forced to give up their territory and move farther west; so that when talking to Americans who said that we

should give back India the reply was that India was forced upon us and we were giving it back. Did the Americans propose to give their empire back to the Red Indians from whom they took it?

Captain LALKAKA, in reply, spoke of the satisfaction and inspiration of meeting so many old friends; much more valuable work could be done if only such a discussion as had taken place could be made more widely known to the general public. He agreed with Lady Hartog in speaking of the blank slate, but the slate was not always blank. Very often it was covered up with all sorts of diagrams of distorted facts and weird beliefs by the insidious and malicious propaganda which had been put over. He recalled a lecture he had attended in a hospital where there were not only officers of the British services, but also Polish, Czech and American officers. The lecture was given by a retired schoolmaster on a topical and important subject, but it was full of dangerous innuendoes against the British. During the discussion he tackled the lecturer, who dodged and prevaricated as much as he could. Some of the audience tried to shout him down until he reminded them that he had come from a part of the Empire far removed from Great Britain to serve her in her hour of danger and it filled him with despair to witness such a defeatist attitude.

The English were always generous in their praise of others and yet so self-deprecatory in the assessment of their own efforts. He felt that this attitude had gone a little too far and it must stop. In the present gathering were those who could draw upon a rich experience of a lifetime of service in many parts of the world, many not even held together by immediate ties of race or blood, but there were greater and stronger bonds which held them together in a common allegiance to their beloved Sovereign and in their belief in the ideals and impulses which were the stuff and substance of the British way and purpose. It was in this he saw the promise of fulfilment of a great and abundant future. Nevertheless, he felt in these momentous days it was very necessary for all to remind themselves constantly that—

"No easy hope or lies
Shall bring us to our goal,
But iron sacrifice
Of body, will and soul.
There is but one task for all—
One life for each to give.
What stands if Freedom fall?
Who dies if England live?"*

Sir HOPETOUN STOKES proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer and to the Chairman for the entertainment and instruction they had given. They had known Captain Lalkaka before his reincarnation as a soldier as a very active and sometimes combative debater in their meetings, and from the account that had been given of his efforts to join the Army they recognized him as a man who would not take "No" for an answer. He (Sir Hopetoun) had the privilege of serving under Lord Erskine when he was in Madras and regarded it as an honour to have done so. The Association was glad to number him amongst its vice-presidents and owed him much gratitude for a most interesting and inspiring address.

* Rudyard Kipling: "For All We Have and Are."

ENGLISH NOVELS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY ON INDIA

By MULK RAJ ANAND

My time today is limited, and I deem myself fortunate that there is in existence an almost up-to-date survey of Anglo-Indian fiction by Professor Bhupal Singh of Lahore; so I can refer any of you who want detailed information on the number and quality of novels about India published in this country to that compendium. All I can offer now are some of my own individual reactions to this kind of fiction and to tell you, very tentatively, of the few novels which I believe to be significant.

The "twentieth century" in the title of this talk does not signify an exact boundary line. In literature one period runs into another or overlaps it, and though technique advances or the content changes according to the demands of the times and sets a new fashion, the influence of the books of a bygone age often survives, especially if society has not gone through any fundamental changes in the meantime. In view of this it would have been more convenient to talk mainly of English fiction about India after the first world war, when a distinct change did come over English writing as a whole. I shall, indeed, mainly have post-1914 books in mind, but perhaps, if only by way of a contrast, it may be as well to say something about the hangover of the Victorian era in the early years of this century.

I might here enunciate one or two considerations which I shall apply to the novelists about whom I speak. First, I believe many English novelists writing about India have been mostly concerned with themselves and the English community in India, particularly in its relationship with the Indian people, and therefore maturing a kind of regional tradition of the English novel, closely linked with the novels written in or around the metropolis of London. Secondly (and this is really a corollary of my first point), the attitude of these English novelists to their own fellow-Englishmen and women, as well as to the Indians who figure in their books, reflects the general attitude towards Empire problems of the period in which they wrote. London is, therefore, the key to India in this as in many other ways.

THE VICTORIAN NOVEL

Now, what exactly was this "hangover of the Victorian era" of which I have spoken? In one word, I call it conventionalism. And by this I mean that certain standards, which were evolved by the rising middle class of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, became in the reign of Victoria a fixed and static tradition, the dead weight of which was choking the life forces. Like the heavy, solid, well-polished furniture of that age, its literature is pompous, comfortable, easy and soft: sensibility has been dulled and no new designs are possible. The characters of the Victorian novel, for instance, have become fixed types, who move according to a pre-ordained plot in certain situations which recur everywhere, and they observe the same rigid morality, exude the same smugness born of bourgeois comfort—except perhaps in the novels of Thomas Hardy, where the elements of revolt express themselves in grave doubt and protest. Towards the nineties Butler, Shaw and Wilde had already begun the offensive against complacency, but they were soon reduced to buffoonery. The romantic novels ended in pessimism, and the symbolist movement in poetry that came from France, as well as the Flaubertian art for art's sake realism, survived into the Edwardian era. "Conventionalism" had almost yielded to a kind of "isolationism."

The late Hugh Walpole has called Britain of this "hangover" period the "doomed fortress." Let me quote his words:

"Perhaps the world will never know again so Paradisiac a mode of living as the moneyed classes enjoyed in England from 1890 to 1910. There was leisure, there was kindly and good humour, there was much intelligent patronage of literature, painting and music, there was good conversation, there was a code of morality that was both

easy and, on the surface at least, decent, there was religion at least in form, there was, above all, an apparent security that allowed the citizens of this little world to preserve their brows untroubled with unseemly anxieties. It appeared to be not only secure but universal; the best kind of life led by the best kind of people. We, with all our terrible experience behind us, see the citizens of this world as a beleaguered garrison in a doomed fortress, beleaguered but fancying themselves as free as air."

These words of a writer who lived through the period describe very adequately the background of the novel of the time. For Henry James, Galsworthy, Conrad, Kipling—all have this in common that they write for, and from the point of view of, the English upper middle class, the class which had built up the Britain of the nineteenth century and was conserving it. And I suggest that as the influence of this class so the influence of these writers continued right up to the declaration of the 1914 war.

KIPLING'S YOUTH

In a recent essay in revaluation, Mr. Edmund Wilson, the American critic, has sought to show the effect on Kipling's work of his school life in Devon. Mr. Wilson delves deep into psycho-analysis and some of his conclusions are bound to remain questionable. But it will be obvious to anyone who has read *Stalky & Co.* what the results of a public-school education have been on the upper middle class in England. The early removal of a child from its environment into a boarding-school makes for self-reliance. But on the sensitive child, like Kipling, it seems to have had an altogether untoward effect. Mr. Wilson shows how the beatings he received at the house where he lodged arrested his emotional growth and created that neurosis which is evident in the preoccupation with fear, punishment and revenge in his work; in the exaltation of barbarian heroes like Stalky, Beetle and Mac'lurk on the one hand, and the insidious contempt for heroism on the other; and also the isolation which makes him incapable of drawing any but flat characters in his novels and the substitution of incident for emotional crises in his stories.

Unlike Maupassant, who burns like a flame throughout a story, Kipling flutters like a moth, leaving us in the dark for long intervals and keeping us guessing. The flashes and hints he thus drops may be taken for profound spiritual illumination, but in view of the violence of the moral code which emerges in his poetry and elsewhere it soon reveals itself as mere ingenuity. This kind of trick is, of course, very helpful to a certain kind of short story. And Kipling, who is a great master of narrative, uses this and other limitations of his make-up to enhance his craft in a superlative manner. Witness, for instance, how his childish naïveté transforms itself into fantasy, how his adolescent admiration for engineers and old sweats serves to bolster up a reactionary political belief and pass that off for a sense of history.

I believe that though Kipling has a genuine enough local sense about India, it is the moral and mental qualities which he acquired at school in the light of which his novels and stories about India ought to be judged. In this regard there is little or no development in Kipling from *Plain Tales from the Hills* through the novels to the very last stories, for his childlike mischievous attitude colours everything, now leading to vulgarity, now to cunning or fantasy, but always to a kind of irrelevant vigour. Mrs. Hawkesby is the first victim of this boyish fun, but really not a victim at all, for she does not exist, except as a puppet on the stage of Kipling's distant view of Simla: she is a *tour de force* if you like. She talks witty like a character in a book, and not as people do even in a Simla club. As she goes round Simla, to dinners and balls, she becomes a caricature who displays Kipling's bitter hatred of the social life of the hill station without acquiring any reality whatsoever. If you ask, How then did she come to be so popular a character with the Kipling public? I shall answer that that is due to his sheer literary virtuosity. For at 24 he was a brilliant journalist who, self-confessedly, was not driven by the passion to write, but was just trying out his skill "at that sort of thing."

KIPLING'S PHILOSOPHY

It is well known by now that the then assistant editor of the *Civil and Military Gazette* was a withdrawing creature, with an acute sense of inferiority, who found it difficult to move in Anglo-Indian society. (I use the term Anglo-Indian in the old

sense in which it is used by Kipling himself.) Though he admires the civil and military officials a great deal, he has not for them the sympathy displayed for Russian officers and officials by the born novelist Tolstoy in his *Cossacks* or *Sevastopol Sketches*. Kipling looks at them from the outside and, knowing that he winces where the passions are involved, increasingly turns to fantasy, or to the story with a comment which need not necessarily depend on characterization. Thus social and political views are thrust forward with an extraordinary plausibility.

Once the reader accepts the premisses of this charming naïveté the rest follows easily enough. Little six-year-old Tod amends a bill on land tenure for the legal member of the Government of India by prattling to him the talk he has heard in the bazaar. McGoggan may have come to India believing in the good of humanity, but one day, as he is telling his sceptical friends at the club to put their heart and soul into the service of the country, he is suddenly stricken dumb. The doctor calls it aphasia. But the point of the story is that in India you don't have to talk about humanity, you really see humanity and you do the little you can for it without straining yourself overmuch, for you are only here for a short term and you can't alter much. Your belief in science and philosophy are all hollow mockeries! The ideal administrator, according to Kipling, is a practical, simple kind of man, who obeys orders and accepts the incredible, because he must not be found in the wrong at any point. Since his own experience, however, reveals that he may occasionally be found wanting, the best thing is not to try to use your wits but to follow the safe rules of the game. This simple wisdom remains the motive force of most of the stories till the very end: it is the only real cue for passion in the whole work of a lifetime—imperialism.

If the terrific sense of inferiority about the English in India made Kipling look on them from the outside, his colossal sense of superiority makes him more distant and detached from Indians. Of course, he eavesdrops in the bazaar, even walks down Anarkali and talks to the tradesmen in broken Hindustani, and is well aware of the life in the servants' quarter behind his bungalow and at the office. And with his uncanny gift of phrase he produces brilliant naturalistic writing. But where the realism of the French writers who influenced him most, I mean Zola and Maupassant, is instinct with pity, his reports are imbued with an undertone of contempt. The people about him, groaning and moaning in their sleep, or dragging along by the roadside, are mere figures on a landscape, no different from the dogs who bark their heads off in *The City of Dreadful Night*. And when one of them from the educated minority emerges after a period in England, and through the good offices of a Viceroy who wishes to give the natives posts of responsibility in order to train them in self-government, the results fail to justify the experiment. Mr. Grish Clunda Dé, M.A., the man who is recommended for the post of the "head of the district," resigns even before taking the appointment because he fears that he could not hope to instil the fear of law into Khusrau Kheyel, the Afghan border brigand, as Mr. Dé's English predecessor, Mr. Tallentine, had been able to do. It is not a question of religion or ability, it is simply a question of history: Khusrau had had relations with the country-men of the new head and they were not relations of respect or obedience!

Kipling's belief in order and its corollaries, respect and obedience, are further reinforced by his sedulous insinuation of India being a mysterious country where none of the solid values of the West apply. This view is scattered all over the stories, in the form of vague hints about the unreliability of the Indian mind, its sudden renunciations and its weird faith in spiritual powers and so on. But what passes muster in short fiction, based on incident, makes the only two novels which Kipling wrote about India so hopelessly opinionated as to deprive them of all significance as novels.

The most ambitious of these long works, *Kim*, becomes a fairy-tale in which all the ingredients of Kipling's superficial knowledge of India are served up with adroitness and skill. There is the seething India of the bazaars, beyond the Mall Road, of which Kim, an urchin of Irish descent, brings intimations; there is the Tibetan Lama, representative of mystery: and as they both begin to trek along the Grand Trunk Road they meet variously a Rani in a palanquin, owner of jewels and palaces, who is going on a pilgrimage; a retired risaldar, symbol of loyalty and devotion to the Raj; a British regiment route marching; a Pathan horse-dealer and spy; and, ultimately, after many adventures, when the Lama disappears into the home of mystery, Kim,

in his rôle of a prodigy of detection, outwits the Russian agents in the Simla hills and helps to rule India! This may be an amusing adventure story for boys, or even a better detective yarn than Edgar Wallace ever wrote, but it is not a novel in the sense in which the novel has come to be understood.

The Naulakha, the second long narrative, approximates more nearly to the form of the novel. But it is built on a vulgar plot around a necklace of precious stones and descends to such artificiality and bathos that it is not worthy of serious attention.

I have gone into some detail in dealing with Kipling, the chief element in the hangover of the Victorian era, because, accomplished master of narrative as he was, he remained such a pernicious influence on English writers for a long time. It is likely that they shared his ideas and found him an obvious model to follow. But the results were deplorable, for in verse and fictional prose there has been a flood of books in the Kiplingesque manner which has still not ceased to flow. And what in the master was a virtuosity and an original talent sank to pretty abysmal depths in his imitators. The novels of Mrs. Maud Diver and Sir George Macmunn, for instance, should be read as warnings of what happens to writers who do not know how to imbibe influences.

FLORA ANNIE STEEL

One novelist, however, who avowedly began to write under the influence of Kipling but avoided the pitfalls of blind imitation was Mrs. Flora Annie Steel. Starting from premisses very similar to Kipling's she found, as soon as she wrote her novel on the Mutiny called *On the Face of the Waters*, that the faults lay on both sides, English and Indian; and she used the novelist's pity to broaden the understanding by the ruler of the ruled. Mrs. Steel was carried beyond her original hypothesis to the doors of many an Indian home during her researches. She developed a sympathy with Indian life far in advance of her time and greatly in excess of any other Anglo-Indian writer before Forster.

In this connection, a thing that has always struck me in reading Anglo-Indian fiction is that the women English novelists generally seem much more sensitive to the obscure corners of the Indian heart than English men. (I should exclude American women from this rounded compliment, but then did not someone say that they are more masculine?) The reason for the wider range of feeling shown by women writers like Mrs. Steel, Mrs. G. H. Bell or Miss Rathbone may be that the novel form is peculiarly amenable to the emotions and imagination of a section of mankind which has itself long been suppressed. In Mrs. Steel's case, her interest in the suffragette movement gives her deeper affinities with the women of India. This was enhanced by her intimate knowledge of village life and her romantic interest in the history of India. *Indian Scene*, the posthumous collection of her short stories, is, for instance, one of the few real books by an outsider about India. But, in the ultimate analysis, even she was unable, in spite of her courageous attempts, to cross the threshold of the Indian home, except it be into a nobleman's courtyard. And most of her work is a rationalization of the rôle of her compatriots in India. Dan Fitzgerald cables a lie to George Keen's mother when the latter commits suicide in an up-country station. "Cholera," he writes, and, as irony would have it, soon dies himself. Mrs. Steel tries to evoke pathos for the lot of these lonely, hard-working men, but her insistence on the "white man's burden" is the same sense of duty and sacrifice which so often made Kipling sentimental and melodramatic.

Yes, the Victorian hangover was still dominant right up to the 1914 war, and it nearly brought the English novel about India to a premature demise. In the absence of a genuine appreciation of the social, psychological and political problems of Englishmen and Indians, even the best craftsmanship could only produce mawkishness and vulgarity.

In a belated attempt to bolster up Kipling's failing prestige, Mr. Edward Shanks has recently suggested that a profound change came over Rudyard's attitude through the horrors of the 1914-18 carnage, that his political belief in imperialism was transformed into a subtle and mystical respect for "the law," that his mind took an increasingly religious turn and groped round for a church, not Christian, but some kind of a cult with an elaborate ceremonial of initiation, secret signs and a closed

atmosphere. I think it is conceivable that Kipling was shaken by the first great world war, and, at any rate, the germs of all these ideas which Mr. Shanks suggests are certainly to be found in the early Kipling.

Already at the turn of the century, however, the social pattern of the world was changing. H. G. Wells, who knows much about these things, threw in a picture in his prophetic book *War in the Air* in 1905, which I came across at random the other day. It is characteristically snappy and, in my view, better history than the *Cambridge History of India*, because more imaginative. So I will quote it here:

... the British Empire [was] perilously scattered over the globe, and distracted now by insurrectionary movements in Ireland and among all its subject races. It had given these subject races cigarettes, boots, bowler hats, cricket, race meetings, cheap revolvers, petroleum, the factory system of industry, halfpenny newspapers in both English and the vernacular, inexpensive university degrees, motor-cycles and electric trams; it had produced a considerable literature expressing contempt for the subject races and rendered it freely accessible to them, and it had been content to believe that nothing would result from these stimulants. . . . Instead of which Egypt, India and the subject races generally had produced new generations in a state of passionate indignation and the utmost energy, activity and modernity. . . . The governing class in Great Britain was slowly adapting itself to a new conception of the subject races as awaking peoples, and finding its efforts to keep the Empire together under these strains and changing ideas greatly impeded by the tendency of Indians to be highly disrespectful to irascible officials."

E. M. FORSTER

Many other writers of the advance guard in England were noticing this process. All the old uncles—Shaw, Bennett, Galsworthy and Wells himself—were in fact making a frontal attack on the imperial idea and were strongly criticizing the political and social outlook of the ruling classes in Britain. And a whole generation of younger intellectuals, though more concerned with "art" than these novelists, playwrights and pamphleteers, were yet imbibing the outlook of these stalwarts. Among the younger writers, E. M. Forster (only younger in age, because as a novelist he already ranked with the uncles) is important to us here because he was later to write *A Passage to India*, a novel which generally expressed the doubts and fears of the English intelligentsia of that period. Mr. Forster would protest that he was expressing the doubts and fears of no one but himself. Objectively considered, of course, his novel is the quintessence of the attitude of a great many of his contemporaries. But I am fully aware that I am forcing him into a historical pattern rather rudely. For he defined the limits of his approach to his novels with great modesty and restraint: "Only connect," he said somewhere by way of giving us a clue. And it is well known that all that he was interested in was personal relations between human beings. He is very suspicious of, if he does not actually despise, a political attitude in art. I think, of course, that he has been forced by events now and then to take a political attitude, but I must respect his premisses and judge him according to his own theory, which is "only connect."

This theory does not, however, exclude social criticism, or even politics in the broad sense; it only means that Mr. Forster was deeply concerned with the psychological atmosphere of the society in which he grew up and deliberately limited the scope of his inquiry. Thus he had very little to say, but he said it very well; so well, in fact, that a novel by him becomes more than itself, overflowing in significance over the life of his period and into life itself. But primarily he is an English novelist of the Edwardian and Georgian era, firmly rooted in the tradition of Jane Austen and George Meredith, though he extends that tradition to take in something of the detachment of Flaubert. I insist on his Englishness not merely to prove my thesis (that few English novels about India are really about India, but mainly about the little England in India), but because Mr. Forster himself insists on defining his limits and would disclaim the right of people to draw any larger conclusion from his work.

Mr. Forster then took a passage to India, but he really remained at home, for he did not depart from his main theme of personal relations. If his plea (it is really hardly even that) for more kindness in personal relations overflows into political

problems, it is only because man is not only an animal with a capacity for tenderness, but a social and political animal. In fact, Mr. Forster has found his peculiar theme overflowing into other and wider channels all the time. For, though it was mainly the lives of a few people in Sawston or Cambridge or London that he was interested in, it was precisely the isolationism, the snobbery and the provincialism of these people that he despised most. Throughout his novels is reflected his awareness of the vulgarity and obsolescence of the English middle class.

When, therefore, Mr. Forster went to India, one could hardly have expected him to be less ruthless about his own people. He was an independent individual, and he did not discover that either wisdom, tolerance or goodwill were the supreme characteristics of the ruling race in India. What had been more or less implicit in his earlier novels came through with full force in *A Passage to India*. For, after his criticism of the foibles of the middle class and the exaltation, if even romantically, of the men of the soil, the natural men, the untoward criticism of the middle class under conditions where its shyness becomes hauteur is bound to follow. Mr. Forster knew the Burtons and the Turtlons only too well at home; when he saw them transplanted from their modest and human background at home in the exalted position of overlords, he saw how their ignorance and snobbery made for a clumsy pretentiousness and even inhumanity.

But if the English characters in this novel do not appear to advantage, neither do the Indians. The latter gain, of course, in sympathy from the fact that as the down-trodden they are bound to be more charitably treated; also they have the advantage of that naturalness which Mr. Forster much loves; but, essentially, they suffer from the neurosis with which Mr. Forster believes a subject people is bound to be infected.

Whatever else it is meant to show, *A Passage to India* does show that imperialism perverts the character of the imperialists as surely as it breeds its opposite—nationalism. Perhaps the holocaust of 1914-18 confirmed Mr. Forster in his prognostications, but it is likely that though he published *A Passage to India* in 1924 he had already, before the first world war, come to see the hopelessness of the British-Indian situation. The way in which, after their last political talk, Fielding and Aziz drift apart, the symbolic way in which even the horses they are riding cut away from each other, showed definitely that for this author there was no dignity even in the human relationships of Englishmen and Indians, so long as they did not enjoy a political and social equality.

I do not want to give you the impression that Mr. Forster deliberately set out, in this or any other novel, to prove anything or, like Balzac, to paint the society of his time. There is no such simple aim in Mr. Forster's work, and the search for kindness in personal relations becomes in each of his novels a whole psychological complex, in which it is sought to fix the inner and outer lives of human beings into what one may regard not so much a pattern but a poetic whole. I do not believe that he wanted to go as far as his novels take him towards definite conclusions. How modest was his formula—"only connect." And yet how large a volume of life is encompassed through it.

Certainly *A Passage to India* is the first English novel about my country that seems, in spite of its tentative hypothesis, to take in the life of the teeming continent, to suggest the depth and breadth of the land in all its nuances. And how uncanny is Mr. Forster's grasp of character here: whereas in his previous novels intellectual statement is often substituted for the emotions, in *A Passage to India* the English as well as the Indian characters have more life, almost as if the author let himself go for once, even beyond the terms of the classic rules of the novel, as if the shy bird had tried to fly and, suddenly finding wings, had flown on and on, gathering many overtones and undertones of the atmosphere between his flapping wings.

EDWARD THOMPSON

As I have suggested before, the publication of *A Passage to India* coincided with the rise of a new generation of men in Britain, a generation nourished on the Radicals and Fabians, men of a liberal tendency: this book brought the first intimation to many people that the old order in the East was changing.

Edward Thompson, also a liberal, and with a long experience of India as an

educationist, confirmed this view in *An Indian Day*. Coming to fiction from history and religion, Mr. Thompson was, temperamentally and by profession, more positive in his belief in justice and humanity. So that *A Passage to India* and *An Indian Day* are complementary, with only minor differences in emphasis. Whereas the problem before Fielding in the former novel is to be an individual in his relations with Aziz, Vincent Hamar as a judge is faced with all the problems of the moral law. Because he decides a political case in favour of the Indian accused, his countrymen regard him as "anti-English, seditious, a public danger, a traitor, a socialist, a communist, an atheist, a bolshevick," while the Indians applaud. But when he decides another case against the Indians he emerges no better in the opinion of his countrymen but is much misunderstood by the Indians. In the trial of the judge before his own conscience, the human sympathy for the Chatterjee brothers who did what William Tell and Washington did elsewhere is contrasted with the necessity to "do a job" as a job. The denouement is not important because the moral statement is enough as in the ardent Russians. This moral issue also arises in the mind of the Indian I.C.S. man Neogyi. Mr. Thompson thus substitutes pattern for plot. And we have travelled far away from the clumsy incident story and novel with a plot of Kipling. Edward Thompson goes on to contrast the English religion of getting a job done and practical Christianity with Jayananda's view that "it is not energy that proves boldness," for a child or mad dog can run round and round. And he soaks us further in the beauty and squalor of India. And the cumulative effect of his novel becomes that of a rich and overcharged Russian novel, "more descriptive" than Mr. Forster's.

In his later novels about India, such as *Night Falls upon Siva's Hill* and *A Farewell to India*, the moral struggles of some of the characters of *An Indian Day* are carried forward and the documentary element becomes more pronounced. For the Indian liberation movement had by now grown to full maturity and was already entering upon the phase in which the transfer of power to Indian hands dominated the scene.

I am far from suggesting that this broad political problem is ever directly posed in either of these books; Mr. Thompson is still inured to the moral issue; he hates the humbug, the cant and the bragging of both nationalisms and feels that dignity and honour and peace will "only come when the unbragging India comes face to face with the unbragging England." But there is a feeling of pessimism in the later books, as though Mr. Thompson has come to believe that to state a moral problem is not enough. He has not the time to make the novel or poem more than life, however; and he does not, and cannot in view of the closed tradition of the novel, believe that an imaginative creation can change life, in the sense in which D. H. Lawrence was, for instance, trying to make his books do. Therefore, he resorted more and more to direct history and the political pamphlet as a means of expression. He is still full of nostalgia for India; Robin Alden is lonely when he leaves India. He is tormented because he knows fascism is rising in Europe, that already the Nazis are calling the old intellectuals "the ghosts of a dead spirit world," that the second world war is inevitable, and he knows the writer has to face a different set of problems, to reckon with an age of terror.

DENNIS KINCAID

A last note of warning to Englishmen and Indians alike in the face of the gathering storm was given by Dennis Kincaid before he died, in his novel *Their Ways Divide*. Edward Holme follows his father into the Indian Civil Service as unconsciously as one steps into a pair of trousers, and he wears his mild contentment, his liberal tolerance and his detachment with the ease of the born conqueror until he comes up against Nara, a young Indian, the son of an orthodox Brahmin, who, however, turns a rabid nationalist. The natural sympathy between them is enriched by the Englishman's genuine interest and the Indian's warmth, though it is secretly corroded by doubts on both sides, till the cancerous suspicions eat away into the minds of the two friends. In the end Nara becomes a terrorist, while Edward has to function as a District Magistrate, the prey to protracted doubts. Nothing is resolved and Mr. Kincaid is evidently in despair, almost as if he failed to realize that there is nothing final about the seemingly hopeless difficulties between Englishmen and

Indians, that if he waited long enough and analysed the reasons of his despair there would be a change.

Dennis Kincaid died in tragic circumstances, as he was drowned while bathing at Karwar before the second world war began. And since then there has been little fiction by English writers which takes us beyond the issues posed by Forster and Thompson. The contingencies of the defence of India against Japanese militarist aggression have, however, taken quite a few young English and American writers to India. One can only hope that they may take up the challenge to their imaginations implicit in the present "complex" in India.

DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER

A MEETING of the Association was held on Wednesday, April 21, 1943, at the Caxton Hall, S.W. 1, Mrs. G. H. Bell, *o.s.e.*, presiding. Dr. Mulk Raj Anand read a paper entitled "English Novels of the Twentieth Century on India," which was followed by a discussion.

In introducing the lecturer, the CHAIRMAN said that those who had not read his books had missed the pleasure of reading the most delightful English prose. Among his books were *The Village, Coolie, Two Leaves and a Bud, The Untouchable* and *Across the Black Waters*.

After the reading of the paper, the CHAIRMAN said they had listened to a most interesting lecture which was, indeed, of extraordinary interest to anyone who had had the temerity to write a novel about India. She was attracted by Dr. Anand's description of the period as the Victorian "hangover." The hangover doubtless followed its natural course, but it gave birth to a period of discouragement.

It was perfectly true that during the Victorian era there was much complacency. Then, after the war of 1914-1918, fiction became discouraging. Why was that period discouraging? There was no reason why the reaction to a great and poignant disappointment should be mere discouragement. She thought it was discouraging literature because its authors lacked courage, and if the spirit of man became infected with discouragement by it, it was really because the great qualities which should inspire his spirit were invariably disparaged in the literature of the post-war period.

But, though there was complacency in the Victorian era, the greatest novelists escaped it; Sir Walter Scott and Robert Louis Stevenson were not complacent and there was no complacency in the passionate spirit of the Brontës, nor in the stern, iron will of George Eliot. In the midst of discouragement Kipling was never discouraging. He was violent. And, perhaps, where he was violent there was some weakness, but in the centre of his storm there was calm because he knew in what he believed. He had convictions. He did not disparage life. Neither did Flora Annie Steel, who had the courage to write about India. That certainly took some courage. Anglo-Indian authors of novels were hagridden by experts who demanded from them the meticulous accuracy of a Bradshaw. Authors who wrote fiction about India before they had become learned in her innumerable castes and customs might make some blunders, but they imparted their vivid first impressions, and there was an invaluable element in first impressions.

She looked forward to a literature which would give the first impressions made by England on that sensitive and illuminating thing, an Indian's mind. Indians who wrote novels about England would not have so difficult a task as had English authors who wrote about India, for Indians could read all that our literature revealed about England, whereas Anglo-Indian novelists of the period Dr. Anand dealt with were never shown the hidden things of the Indian heart by Indian novelists. They were not educated about India by Indian fiction. Indian women were silent in fiction and had not revealed in novels during that period what Indian women had felt about

purdah or the adventure of emerging from purdah. No Indian woman novelist had published books to give them insight into the tragedy of a mother who knew her widowed daughter must burn. Nevertheless, Anglo-Indian novels did not lack discernment.

She would not have thought, herself, of seeking the aid of a psycho-analyst when reading a book, nor did she think that would enable her to discover mawkishness in Kipling. With regard to *Kim*, a novelist must have the power to create characters.

Today, everybody knew Kim, the Lama, the Old Horsedealer. He might not be like any horsedealer, and the Lama might not be like any Lama, but they lived, moved, and had their being. Dr. Anand had spoken of Edward Thompson, and to her mind his enchanting prose disarmed the criticism that he was too documentary. Personally she valued documents, and if she could not have a good novel she would have a document. Anglo-Indian novels of the period under review had documentary value, for those novelists, willy-nilly, for good or ill, wrote of a time which, let pendulums swing as they might, would know no repetition. The relationship which existed then between the two races would never be the same again. Those novels caught the passing moment. Their authors wrote of what they saw then. Their books would always hold the field because during that brief period nobody else was in the field.

She did not regret that Kipling chose to write about soldiers. When she was young she had a conviction that the soldier counted and that he was, perhaps, the Man of Destiny for her and her generation. An author who wrote about soldiers was in good company. Pericles' words about them still lived. Shakespeare's pen did not reject them. There was good reason to regret that in the great years of the Indian Army's history no Indian soldier had written their splendid story; but happily Dr. Anand had written a fine book, *Across the Black Waters*, which told the tale of the first impressions Indian soldiers received when they landed in France to take part in war in Europe. It was a very valuable novel.

Dr. Anand spoke of the future and also of the opportunity presented to American and English authors who were now in India while Japan was at the gate. She would like to add "Indian writers, too." Let all three give a great literature to the world. G. M. Trevelyan wrote of another time of national danger in these words: "While the Armada was going to pieces on the rocks, England was at last entering on the wider spaces of her destiny, and the sense of adventure in untrdden regions of mind and matter inspired the rising generation, who went out in the spirit of free, individual initiative to explore new worlds of land and water, knowledge and imagination. At that propitious moment the English language reached its perfection of force and beauty in the mouths of men and at that moment Shakespeare lived to use it." Mrs. Bell hoped that such might be the fate of literature in India.

Mr. ERNEST SHORT (Secretary, Authors' Club) congratulated the Association very much upon the address to which the members had listened and upon the illuminating addendum which had come from the Chair. He only wished that more of his colleagues at the Authors' Club could have been present. He had always been interested in the way in which the great British public could be interested in public affairs, and had come to the conclusion that the only way to make the public understand these things was to approach the problems imaginatively. On analysis, there was no other way of approaching so complex a problem as that of India except through the novel or the various arts, and it was because the case for the Indian novel written by Englishmen had been put so strongly that he thought the Association should be congratulated. He very much hoped that not only would there be more novels written about India for the consumption of English men and women, but also that English people would have more opportunity of knowing the great arts of India. The India Museum at South Kensington was not sufficient, and nothing could be more welcome in this country than a great Indian Exhibition of the type given at the Royal Academy in their pre-war winter exhibitions. We had seen the art of Flanders, of Italy and of France in their fulness; the art of India expressed in that same beautiful and full way would be a very excellent addition to English novels about India.

He could not agree with all Dr. Anand's arguments. In particular he felt he had dealt with the younger Kipling. The Kipling of *Plain Tales from the Hills* was by no means the full Kipling; he would have suggested that *The Day's Work* was far more the real Kipling than the earlier Kipling, and he would like Dr. Anand to look into a story such as *William the Conqueror*, with its background of plague conditions, to see if he did not come to a more generous view of Kipling than that in the paper. The character of William the Conqueror, that charming Anglo-Indian woman, was plain after reading, as was that of the excellent gentleman, Scott, who handled the goats so well for the benefit of the starving Indian children. If this Kipling was put against the Kipling which Dr. Anand was forced to put into his argument, the writer of the paper would feel more kindly towards a great Anglo-Indian.

The speaker also wished to thank the lecturer for the way he dealt with a great problem—bringing understanding of the Indian mind to the English mind, and, equally important, that of bringing understanding of the English mind to the Indian mind. The imaginative way was the only one out of a difficult situation, and artists could be infinitely useful. In this connection, too, he would remind Dr. Anand of the work of Edwin Arnold in *The Light of Asia*, which introduced so many English readers to Buddhism.

It had been a joy to hear that works of imagination, though not works of politics in the ordinary sense of the word, could do a very great deal to bring about better understanding between two great peoples.

The CHAIRMAN said that Dr. E. M. FORSTER wrote as follows :

"The paper strikes me as excellent, and as provocative, and there should be some interesting talk. My own criticism is that the test it applies to novels is much too simple. It considers them as social and political statements, and the novelist as conditioned by his surroundings, and as occupied (though often unconsciously) in expressing them. Well, it is quite right that novels and novelists should be so considered, but there is something else, and Anand misses it out. He omits the fact that people enjoy writing books, and often write them in the hope of causing enjoyment to others. This enjoyment in writing is the root of the impulse called art, which he seems to mistrust or despise, since I observe that he prints it between inverted commas. It is clear to me, for example, that Kipling enjoyed writing *Kim*, and that this makes it a good book, whatever its sociological or psychological limitation. Anand condemns it as 'without significance.' Without significance of what? I suppose he means that it is not as enlightened as it might have been considering the date at which it was published. I think the test too narrow a one. Before a final verdict can be reached we must also apply that other test and consider whether Kipling had pleasure in writing and whether he got it across. I hope Anand does not think pleasure wrong. The worst of our Western curses has descended upon him if he does."

Sir ALFRED WATSON said that the paper had challenged most of their conceptions or misconceptions of the English novel about India. The complaint that Dr. Anand made against English writers was that the village blacksmith was not also a master of fine stitchery. The novelist must be judged by how well he had done what he set out to do. A novelist could only deal effectively and convincingly with the life which he knew, with the experiences through which he had passed, and it was no real criticism of English writers about Indian affairs that they had not been able to get right within the skin of the Indian. One did not expect Dickens or Thackeray to give an intimate picture of French life; one turned to Zola or Maupassant for that. So the English writer on India and Indian life had necessarily confined himself almost entirely to the aspects which he knew. He could not have that intimate touch with Indian home life for which one looked in a novel by an Indian writer.

He rather regretted that Dr. Anand had not gone outside the scope of his original address to deal with some later Indian writers, because a very remarkable literature was now coming from the press in India. Most of it was charged with insipid gloom; those who knew India did not feel this gave a right interpretation of Indian

life or of the Indian people whom they had known. These Indian novelists failed most lamentably in their interpretation of the Englishman.

Personally he had no undue admiration for Kipling. Much of his writing was not only out of date but was never in date, but some of the criticisms that had been urged that afternoon were wide of the mark. He agreed that Mrs. Hawksley was such a woman as there never was on land or sea, and yet she was the quintessence, the raising to the n^{th} power of a woman whom all present had met in life. When it was alleged that Kipling did not understand the Indian character he thought of the Bengali babu in *Kim* anxious to become a Fellow of the Royal Society, at the same time pursuing detective duties, and of that final scene where he tackled the Russian spy. No Indian could have so truly interpreted the character of the Bengali, at times timid and nervous, but in the supreme moment rising to the height of heroism.

He felt rather uneasy about the criticism offered of Mrs. Flora Annie Steel—that she descended ultimately to the "same sense of duty and sacrifice which so often made Kipling sentimental and melodramatic." No woman who had ever gone to India had a greater sense of duty and self-sacrifice or exemplified it more fully in her daily life. The note of her novels was also the note of the real living woman, and duty and self-sacrifice were not themes for disparagement.

Dr. Anand had reserved his highest approval (and that reached no great height) for the novels of Mr. Forster and Mr. Edward Thompson. They had all read these with appreciation of their qualities, but it was perhaps remarkable that Dr. Anand should give highest approval to those novels which marched most nearly with his own political sympathies. That was a natural bias, but not the best criterion for literary criticism. The man who would be the critic of the work of others must be capable of moving outside the range of his personal likes and dislikes.

A letter from Mr. EDWARD THOMPSON was then read from the Chair, as follows :

"Anand is right about our people in India being dependent on what London thinks. We cannot help that, for we are an expatriated community and can know only the work which is recommended to us. He is right, too, in what he says about 'the closed tradition of the novel.' My own conviction, for years, is that as a literary form the novel is as run down and disorderly as the blank verse play was after Shakespeare and, indeed, in Shakespeare's own last years. Many of us have written novels chiefly because it happened to be the dominant literary form—as the blank verse play was in Shakespeare's time—and because it was the only way to get a hearing. I have always thought that Forster, for example, was really meant to be a great short story writer. The novel is finished now, at any rate, though no doubt novels of a sort will continue to be written. If novels are now alive at all, it is nearly always because of other qualities than those of the true novel. No one reads them for the story, but they read them for episodes—in which *A Passage to India*, also *Kim*, are so rich—for natural description, for incidental social or political criticism. Anand obviously knows this; I wish he would expand it.

"The sad truth remains, after all, that the fiction and verse we have written about India is about the poorest department of our literature. I have my own theories as to why this is so, but I have said too much."

Mr. C. A. KINCAID wrote :

"I agree with Mulk Raj Anand's criticisms of Anglo-Indian writers. They only really write well about Anglo-Indians; but then Indians themselves only write well about their own provinces. Hari Narayan Apte has written excellent novels about Poona, his own home town; Tagore has written admirable books about Bengal. Neither Apte nor Tagore would have had any success if the former had written about Bengal or the latter about Maharashtra. It is almost impossible to get inside the skin of people of a different race."

Mr. HILTON BROWN, speaking as one who had written a good deal about India, thanked Dr. Anand for his illuminating address. Those who were trying to "sell" India to the great British public and to bring a ray of light into their black ignorance on this subject should be only too grateful to anyone who would come forward and tell them about it.

He was surprised that Dr. Anand had said so much about Kipling; it was a fact that *Kim* was published in 1901, and so came within the terms of Dr. Anand's title, but it was thought out and partially written some years before that date. The Kiplings were then residing in Vermont, and he thought *Kim* was produced as the result of nostalgic recollections between Kipling and his father. Kipling would be the last person to class *Kim* as a novel.

Dr. Anand would admit that Kipling took advantage of his opportunity. When he went out to India he perhaps created an India which never existed, but certainly he painted a picture which impressed itself on the minds of others for a long time to come. The mere fact that he was able to take advantage of his opportunity showed up rather badly those who had come after and had not been able to take advantage of it. Modern writers had not written of India as they should or might have written if they had been able to take advantage of the opportunities given; he did not know why that was; he supposed those who knew had not the time and the others simply did not know. The result had been that India had become a magnificent back curtain, in front of which all sorts of writers put all sorts of characters. He was thinking of a book called *When the Rains Came*, which seemed to be a good novel about the Middle West of America; it sold in enormous numbers and, of course, went one stage further in creating an entirely false impression in the minds of millions of people, and those who could have written with a little more knowledge had nothing to do but sit back in despair.

However that might be, he did not think writers had taken advantage of their opportunities in India as they should have done. He agreed that E. M. Forster's book, *A Passage to India*, was an outstanding exception, but he thought that was due rather to the beauty and excellence of its writing than to its accuracy or truth. He would like to have asked Mr. Forster in public a question regarding the exact section of the Indian Penal Code under which Aziz was charged and in what court did Mr. Forster ever see such procedure carried on as took place at Aziz's trial!

Much had been said about Indian writers coming forward to tell us about themselves. He had only a quarter of a century's experience and could not write about the affairs of an Indian household. We were dependent on the Indians coming forward to give us the inside picture of these things. It was difficult, if not impossible, for there was a barrier between the English and Indians in India which was not always raised by one side, and it was from the other side of the barrier that enlightenment must come. During his stay in Madras he tried to encourage young Indian writers to come to him with stories or sketches of Indian life, and some were very promising indeed. Some were the reverse for the reason—this was why he was speaking and he wanted Dr. Anand to remember what he said—that they were imitative and would write about lords and ladies in Park Lane instead of what they knew about their own affairs. If he might lay a fresh burden on Dr. Anand and place himself further in his debt, he would ask him to beseech his friends in India to write those things which we wanted to know. Dr. Anand knew what people over here wanted to know and should ask his friends in India to tell us about these things.

Dr. RANJEE G. SHAHANI said that a literary lecture was a very welcome change, and Sir Frank Brown was to be thanked for arranging it. Dr. Anand was a writer for whom he had respect. He had anticipated that Dr. Anand would wholly condemn Kipling and give first-class marks to Forster and Thompson, and in this he had not been disappointed. Here he would ask whether books were to be judged politically or from an æsthetic or spiritual point of view. Of course, Indians had very little liking for Kipling. Personally, he had nothing but respectful contempt for him; yet he was not blind to his qualities. It had been commonly said that the English understood no one but themselves, and that also not very well. Thomas Hardy confined himself to a certain section of the community and could make nothing of the upper classes. The same was true of Galsworthy. Why, then, should Kipling be blamed for not comprehending the inwardness of India? He himself, though an Indian, would not pretend to know the whole of India—no one could know a country the size of India thoroughly.

Kipling had drawn Indians all wrong. True; yet one was obliged to admit that

there were depths in his work. There were, in fact, two Kiplings : Kipling with the "camera" eye who painted everything he saw, and Kipling the poet and mystic. As for Forster, not a word could be said against him; he was a great and generous man and one of the subtlest artists in Europe. Still, it had to be confessed that *A Passage to India* did not sound the depths of the Hindu soul. But it certainly showed a marvellous appreciation of the Muslim complex. Dr. Anand had praised the novels of Thompson, but Thompson would finally rank as an historian and racial psychologist. The novel as an art-form became something else in his hands. That he had understood Indians better than any other Englishman was true; but, then, he really loved Indians, and love unlocked all gates. Many Englishmen, especially among the younger generation, were anxious to meet Indians half-way, and Indians must play their part. If the English had written badly about India, Indians must not merely damn them but do their best to be fair.

Mr. GEORGE ORWELL said that the point whether the English had written accurately about India needed to be defined a little more clearly than it had been. Anyone who had written a book about India felt the peculiar difficulty of knowing practically nothing about oriental characters. Apart from the obvious difficulties, one could not know what went on as between one oriental and another. One must write about Anglo-India, but these other people must be introduced, which led to elementary mistakes. An example was brought up by one speaker—the court scene in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. It seemed to him that this was really a minor point which could be disregarded. The essential question was not whether one was exactly right about things like names, places and details of that description, but whether one had got, as it were, the essential relationship. Forster, it seemed to the speaker, had done that perfectly. When this book came out in 1923 he (the speaker) was in Burma, and observed the annoyance it caused amongst the British population. He believed he shared that annoyance, but the book struck him as being essentially true because it contained within it the real problem of any European in India—that real intimacy between a European and an Indian was not possible when one was in the position of ruling over the other.

Most Europeans present would know that it was a common experience to feel much more intimate, with a possibility of affection, with people of the servant class or simple villagers than with educated Indians. The reason was that with these there was a feudal relationship. With the educated Indians the relationship should be one of equality, which was impossible while the ruler relationship stood between. Forster's book seemed to bring that out admirably. He could not imagine that any novel would go much beyond that while the relation between Briton and Indian was what it was.

A point which might be of value to Dr. Anand or some other Indian writer was that it would be profoundly interesting to have a novel written about life in England by an Indian. An Indian writer would not make such gross mistakes as the English writer made about Indians, but he would still make mistakes, and the whole problem could be seen in better perspective if there were a few books of that sort available.

The CHAIRMAN said that she had seen extraordinarily happy relations existing in the Indian Army and nobody could tell her that English women and Indian women could not love each other. Their laughter spoke one language and there was no difference in the colour of their tears. She cared nothing in this matter for men's political feelings and was thankful for her friendships and her love for Indian women.

Sir ERNEST HOTSON wished to support what Mrs. Bell had said and firmly contradict the statement that feelings of equality on social matters between Indians and Europeans were impossible at present, because they were not.

Dr. ANAND, in reply, said that he felt if he was to be honest to himself and his convictions he could not possibly have given a string of names by way of a lecture on twentieth-century English novels on India with the inevitable decorous compliments thrown in after every second sentence. That was not his task; he took his task as a literary critic seriously, though there were many shortcomings in this approach as the time was limited. In his view of the whole of this series of English novels on India,

of which he had read many, he had deliberately limited himself to an *internal* approach, so that he may not be accused of judging them from premises other than those which their authors themselves adopted. For instance, he had avoided judging Mr. Forster on political grounds. As for Kipling, he could not help thinking of his works except from the point of view from which Kipling himself wrote. There was no one who could equal him in his enthusiasm for Kipling; he had read a great deal of his work and no one could say Kipling was not a great writer, but he believed that the only homage one could pay to a genius was to pull him to pieces—and Kipling could stand that treatment! Certainly there was a development in Kipling's work which was very important. Also, it was true that the tests applied to fiction were certain general tests—character, atmosphere, etc. He had applied those tests. But Kipling went further than that. He did actually in his verse, as well as in his prose, adopt a deliberate attitude—imperialism. Recently, in a collection of Kipling's poems, Mr. T. S. Eliot had tried to prove that Kipling's imperialism was of a very noble kind. Again, in another book, Mr. Shanks had suggested that the holocaust of 1914-1918 had changed Kipling's imperialistic attitude very considerably. But he believed that Kipling had never completely renounced his imperialism. For lack of time he could not trace Kipling's later development as he could have wished.

He thought one was bound to be biased in this kind of essay by one's political opinions, as Sir Alfred Watson suggested. He himself was biased in favour of a liberalizing kind of view, but he thought that Sir Alfred was biased, too, though he did not avow that bias.

Mrs. Bell had brought out something which he would like to stress—her belief in courage. Many of the young in India, China and Russia believed in courage because they had to build a new India, a new China and a new Russia; he had always felt that the young in Europe did not believe strongly enough in this kind of heroism. India was in hopeless difficulties at the present time, but the young there had at least the virtue of courage. To that he would like to add their belief in poetry—the imaginative, creative belief in a new India and the courage to make that new India.

Sir Louis DANE proposed a vote of thanks to the Chairman for her skill in guiding the discussion on a difficult subject and to Dr. Anand for his good paper on this subject. As Rudyard Kipling and Mrs. Flora Annie Steele were old personal friends of his, he might offer some remarks on their work. Rudyard was the son of John Lockwood Kipling, Principal of the School of Art and Curator of the Lahore Museum. His mother was one of the three talented Miss Macdonalds, whose sisters married two Presidents of the Royal Academy. When he first came out at sixteen or seventeen he was a very rough diamond and seemed likely to be a misfit, but after a year's residence with his clever family he made a rapid improvement. The home atmosphere was artistic and literary, and the four members of the family produced a good Christmas revue under the title of "The Quartette." His father was a mine of information on all subjects of Indian handicrafts and out-of-the-way arts and life generally. Rudyard naturally absorbed a good knowledge of all this in a short time, and this explained how in a comparatively short and limited residence in India he learnt so much about aspects of Indian life, particularly as affecting Europeans. Money was not too plentiful and Rudyard had to take up a small post in the *Civil and Military Gazette*. After a time he struck out in writing short stories, *Plain Tales from the Hills*, which proved an immediate success, and his career was assured. Dr. Mulk Raj Anand did not altogether approve of his work and evidently thought he might have written more for Indian India, but he did not perhaps remember that when Kipling began to write in about 1880 the English-knowing Indian readers in the Punjab were very few and his work would not have achieved much success. He wrote mainly at first for the Anglo-Indian world and of the points of contact between that world and Indian life in a large city, and his work was very true for those conditions, and still is.

Mrs. Steel found more favour with Dr. Anand and she certainly had a more intimate knowledge of general Indian and zenana life. But she was in advance of her time and very impetuous, and some of her activities had to be restrained or serious trouble might have resulted amongst Indian families.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY IN INDIA

By IRIS PORTAL

I HAVE been requested to eschew politics in this talk which I am privileged to give today. This request is superfluous, because it is my conviction that for the ordinary individual to approach Indian problems from a political angle is unprofitable. And I am speaking as an ordinary individual who has spent twenty inconspicuous years in India moving about and making friends among those of my kind, most of us free from the responsibilities and, possibly, some of the prejudices of pro-consular positions. Someone whom I revere greatly said to me recently, "Politics is a science; do not meddle with it." And I would like to give the same advice to all ordinary individuals who have, by choice or necessity, to study the problems of India today—by choice because they may be interested, by necessity because they may be going to live and work in that great country at this most critical hour in her history and ours.

I will confess that I came back from India five months ago fired with a positively missionary zeal to bring home to the man in the street the interest and urgency of Indian affairs, and to attempt to dispel, not only in the street but in the seats of the mighty, some of the ignorance and misunderstanding that appeared to us, out there, to be prevalent in England. So it was with especial interest that I listened to a lecture given recently by Captain Lalkaka before this Association, and also to the speeches in the discussion. It was encouraging to be told that the British public was interested in India, because I had been assured by responsible people in touch with publicity that this was not so, and I had felt what the Americans call "slapped back." I am conscious, of course, that those whom I have the privilege to address this afternoon are not "ordinary individuals," but "people of importance," whose knowledge of India I would not presume to replenish. But I know your influence and note the aims for which this Association stands, so I do greatly appreciate the opportunity to put before you recent impressions of India and a few diffident suggestions as to how the ordinary individual can do his or her share in finding a solution.

THE CHANGING SCENE

I have noticed, since my return, a certain complacency about India among those who are interested, varied by a puzzled atmosphere of outraged virtue on the part of many who, in their day, did their duty nobly and cannot understand why their labours would now seem to be brought to nought. Even to those who have quite recently returned I would point out that the changeless East is changing every hour under the impetus of war. India is on the verge of an industrial revolution, and the introduction of motor transport, the cinema and the radio has had a profound effect on the psychology of the people. Whether for better or worse is not the point; the fact remains that the effect has come to stay. Moreover, war conditions have resulted in large movements of population, soldiers where there were none before, the opening up of little-known tracts to the influence of mechanical civilization, and a general disintegration of daily life. I think I am right in saying that all this is greatly in excess of what happened in the last war, when India was not directly threatened. And the disintegration of custom results in a stirring up of thought. The quality of this thought is too big a subject for me to deal with; I only want to consider how we are meeting it.

I am reminded of two verses from the book of Isaiah: "The vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot for it is sealed: and the book is delivered unto him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned." The question is, how to unseal the book, how to clear the vision? Many of you today, and those who have followed you on to the red carpets of India, are the "learned." Would it be impertinence to suggest that the book is sealed because of your so great learning? In other words, that our splendid

machinery of administration has become so complicated, so hedged around with pomp and circumstance that human values, in their simplicity, are being obscured? As for the unlearned, whom I represent and to whom I am really speaking, is it too late for us to learn what we stand for in India and what our responsibility means?

You may feel that I am twin-sister to Captain Lalkaka's lecturer of the "sly innuendoes." This would be inaccurate. I have profound veneration for the magnificent administration given by us to India, for the justice and prosperity conferred by the *Pax Britannica*. I believe in the integrity of all those great Britons who, from Lord Lawrence onwards, have made it clear that they were working for India's ultimate self-government. In short, I do not propose to be deprecatory about our national achievement.

For this very reason it is bitter to see a betrayal of the best in us by individual British behaviour now. This betrayal arises partly from ignorance and bad manners. It should be possible to correct both these defects. But, above all, it arises from a general lack of personal responsibility, and that is a much more subtle evil and harder to control or alter. Hand in hand with this lack goes an attitude which is made up of inherited and undigested prejudice, combined with a *theory* of racial superiority quite unsupported by practice. We have impressed the ideal of democracy on the Indian mind, and educated Indians, with their customary interest in spiritual things, have studied the teachings of our religion. We are supposed to be the champions of Christianity and democracy. Surely one way of fighting for them is to live them? I like the words of Mr. Henry A. Wallace in his recent speech on "The Christian Bases of the World Order":

"The democratic philosophy pervades not only the hearts and minds of those who live by the Christian religion, both Protestant and Catholic, but of those who draw their inspiration from Muhammedanism, Judaism, Hinduism, Confucianism and other faiths. When we look beneath the outer forms we find that all these faiths, in one way or another, preach the dignity of each individual soul, the doctrine that God intended man to be a good neighbour to his fellow-man and the doctrine of the essential unity of the entire world."

I am conscious that this quotation is controversial. Someone will certainly say, for instance, "Hinduism is not a faith." True, but I think it can be called the thought of a people. Surely a closer study of this thought, and the thoughts that builds up all the great religions, might be of help to ordinary individuals groping their way about India. When the outer forms of Hinduism repel the Christian he might look beneath them at the fundamental teaching of the Hindu Scriptures. Then, as Mr. Wallace says, he will find truths familiar to him; that is to say, if he has ever looked beneath the outer forms of Christianity. If he asks, "Why has the wisdom of the ancient Hindus been perverted?" let him honestly see if he can claim that Christianity is expressed in its original purity today, either individually or nationally.

A SUGGESTION

I think that the most constructive suggestion I can offer is that those of us who are working in India, and especially those newly going there, should analyse and apply Mr. Wallace's statement. I would like to feel that every British man and woman who has anything to do with India is a practising Christian Democrat. When he or she lands in India, swarming hosts of human souls will rise up from the docks of Bombay. Then, as the train groans up the ghats and roars on its lonely course north, south, or east, each toiling figure in the immensity of the dusty plain is a human soul. The babu in the station; the man in the oilman's stores in the bazaar; the tonga-wallah; the rude student who shouts "Quit India" from a Congress procession; servants, subordinates; distant and courteous Indians met at official functions—all are human souls the same as each of us here, and we all have a right to our individual dignity. Does the individual British soul realize his responsibility? In so far as he keeps order and maintains a just administration—yes. But in so far as he demonstrates consistently the religious and political faith he represents—no. And the only way to teach him or her is by education and, above all, leadership—religious, political, and social.

"This is a plastic world, and ideas make it." The British, as a whole, never

exchange ideas with Indians. Is it—horrible thought—because most of us out there have lost the habit of having any ideas to exchange? A diet of polo, mah jong, and bridge is not very nourishing to ideas. But there is also the bugbear of prestige. What is prestige? Surely it is something *intrinsic*, not what you appear to be, but what you are. If you are worthy of respect you will be respected, and joining in the life and customs of the country you live in, and are helping to govern, will not diminish that respect. If you are not worthy of respect you won't get it, for all the red carpet and *chaprassées*. Hedged in by this escapist theory of prestige, this intellectual and artistic timidity, many of us miss the entrancing richness of Indian culture and Indian thought. And, what is worse, we miss the opportunity of meeting Indians on a ground where mind can speak to mind, and political bitterness be forgotten.

INDIAN CULTURE

In administration India still has much to learn from us. But I contend that in cultural appreciation and philosophy we have much to learn from her. Can we not pool our resources and find understanding? Only individuals can bring this to pass. Thanks to Macaulay's famous Minute, every Indian high-school child has to puzzle his way through "The Wreck of the Schooner *Hesperus*" or some such rubbish. This system has given the country a *lingua franca*, I admit, but there might have been more to commend it if our British children learnt something of India's culture and history in their turn. So that when the races meet as grown men and women there could be some mutual sympathy.

I may say, in passing, that my brother and I, as children, did learn something of these subjects. Not at school, of course, but at home. And that is one of the many reasons why India has never seemed a strange land to either of us. I remember a very hot day last April when I was occupied with the frequently repeated task of despatching all our worldly possessions from a goods yard. Everyone was tired and irritable in the dry wind and blowing dust, and no one more so than myself and the babu in charge. In fact, the stage was set for one of those familiar, tragic scenes of bad temper and misunderstanding which often mar our daily life in India. On the table in the office I suddenly noticed a copy of Goldsmith's poems. "Do you read this?" I said, picking it up. He started off at once, "Sweet Auburn, loveliest village of the plain," and left me far behind in his knowledge of eighteenth-century literature in general and Goldsmith in particular. And I couldn't produce one line of any Indian masterpiece, only memories of potted versions of the great epics which used to entrance my childhood. "But why Goldsmith?" I asked. "I know exactly how he felt about that village," said the babu, and I knew exactly how the babu felt about Goldsmith. We did establish a most charming understanding, and an atmosphere of goodwill, and went on to discuss current affairs without any bitterness. I have had many and many a delightful understanding of the same sort with more sophisticated Indians, from whom I have learnt a great deal about my own national culture as well as immeasurably much about theirs. You cannot quarrel or be unreasonable with people when you have shared with them ideas that are eternal. Political ideology is of entirely secondary importance to the truths of all the great arts. In the same way, entering into Indian family life and taking Indians into our own home circle should be the most natural thing in the world. The fact that we have different social customs adds to the interest of contact. When you enter someone's home you come upon universal truths which are common to us all. As a woman I have, of course, had more chance to do this than a man would have. But a large proportion of the British community in India are women, and I have no hesitation in saying that (though there are, happily, outstanding exceptions) they have done more to make misunderstanding between our two races than any other single factor.

THE LANGUAGE QUESTION

I noted that some of the speakers at Captain Lalkaka's lecture deplored the "writing on the slate" of the British public mind as regards India. And an example of this erroneous writing was given—namely, that it had been heard declared that British officials in India could not even speak the language of the country. Of course this is an exaggeration, but there is a sufficient germ of truth in the so-called "Leftist"

propaganda to make it doubly dangerous. This question of language is of great importance, as obviously no general understanding is possible without it, no social contact. Leading officials of the I.C.S. have command of the languages necessary to their work. But the ordinary individual most definitely has not. I fail to see how you can understand a man until you can speak with him in his own tongue, or how you have any right to demand his respect if he—often illiterate—can speak your language when you are too lazy to learn his. And when I say learn I mean in the real sense. I do not consider the mouthing of "Sahib's Urdu" or the strange jargon spoken by Englishwomen to their servants as language at all. I want to make a special point about the language deficiency; it illustrates my argument, and it should be possible to remedy such a defect. You cannot refute malevolent propaganda or wipe out the writing on the slate until you remove what gives rise to it.

I took over a division of Girl Guides at the beginning of the war in a Mahratha district. A divisional area in the Guide world is a fairly wide one, and I had in mine a city and two country districts. My first step was to summon a rally and address those who attended. Anyone who knows Mahrathas will remember their sense of mockery. I don't like making speeches in Urdu, though I can and have done it, but anyway it was no use to me there, so I spoke in English. My words were received with merry laughter. I stopped and asked what was the joke, as I would like to share it. One of my Guide officers stood up and answered in perfect English, "It is so funny to hear you speak in English, because of course half the girls can't understand you." I pointed out that it would be much funnier if I spoke in Mahrathi, but what I *couldn't* say was "Not as funny as your English." I promised them that one day I would try to speak to them in quite serious Mahrathi, but as I left the district after six months I never accomplished this feat, though I did thereafter talk to them in what I hoped was tolerable Hindi. Anyway, we all became very good friends, and I learnt to say "God bless you" in Mahrathi, and that is a happy phrase in any country.

While doing this particular work I made many friends among Mahratha ladies of education and extremely anti-British political views. But if we kept off politics and talked of the things that women like to talk about all the world over—homes, children, cooking, and husbands—we established a real understanding. And I feel that in time we could have talked politics without rancour too, and learnt more of each other's difficulties and how to solve them hand in hand. There were some Englishwomen on my Girl Guide local association, but they had had no meetings for a long time, because the Indian ladies were afraid to come up to the cantonment and had no transport, and the English ladies were afraid to go into the city. This curse of fear! There was nothing to be afraid of, but when I did at last bring them together—in the city—the drawn sword of fear and suspicion lay between them still, and neither race spoke to the other or exchanged any idea for the common good. Yet we were met to forward an experiment in citizenship which had in it the seeds of benefit for us all.

THE INDIAN SOLDIER

I would like to talk a little about the Indian Army. For a woman to talk about any army is an impertinence, I suppose, but I do claim to know something about the Indian soldier as a human personality. I spent my early childhood touring Rajputana and the Punjab in a tonga, watching my Civilian father dispense durbar justice under the trees to the forbears of the type of man my soldier husband has commanded throughout two wars, and the years between. I have often been a guest and, I hope, a friend in their homes and among their wives and children, and I spent last year nursing them in military hospitals.

I have been told by responsible people that the Indian soldier is not representative of India, as he is only drawn from certain classes. As regards the Indian Army of today that is entirely inaccurate. Every area of the country now provides recruits, and it is no exaggeration to say that every type of Indian is represented in the ranks. I have been in charge of hospital wards where eight or more different languages were spoken. You could not find a more representative body in India today than the army. I see in this body the most helpful chance of a united India, and I see in it a big

influence on the future of India. The soldier in this war is not just cannon-fodder; he is a man of some education, and frequently a skilled technician. Courage he has always had, but now he has to have brains as well. He has to know some English, to be able to think independently and to act with initiative.

With this must inevitably come the power to question and to criticize. This is especially true of the new types coming into the army, but I have even found it among Jat recruits of a year's service. We always used to send the Indian soldier the best men we had to lead him. Are we now sending our best officers to the Indian Army? Do we prepare them properly for the work they are going to do? Prepare them by information, education, inspiration? And what do we do for the Indian soldier? What of the hospitals he returns to from fighting the battles of democracy? Who asks questions in Parliament about his disability pension? What impressions of Christian democracy is he going to take back to his village when he is discharged? I would like to give answers to all these questions, but because I know that the few men and women of goodwill we have in India today are more than aware of deficiencies, and are striving to amend them without the best of material being available to them, I should be sorry to make their uphill task more difficult by anything said here today.

I would like to end with one of my hospital stories. I am telling it only to illustrate my point that understanding, co-operation and brotherhood between our two races is possible regardless of any barrier of colour or social status. I had quite a struggle to get into I.M.H.s. I was told first that nurses were not needed, and, secondly, that it was unthinkable that Indian soldiers should be ministered to by Englishwomen. Those of us who broke through these curious taboos were first of all stunned to find that we were the only women of any race in the hospitals where we worked; but soon we were amply rewarded by incidents such as I am about to relate. It is an incident characteristic of the chivalrous and ever-courteous attitude of all the patients and could be matched by many more of the same type experienced by other Englishwomen who have had the privilege of tending the Indian soldier. All the time I was nursing, both with the Salvation Army and the Indian Army, I was always called "Sister," though I had no right to the title. It so happened that in one military hospital where I had been working alone for some time we heard of the approaching advent of a staff of professional nurses. One of my most interesting patients, a Muslim from Multan, came to talk to me along with his best friend, a Mahratha from the Poona district. I said to them, "You must not call me 'Sister' when the burra matron sahib comes here, and all the real Sisters." There was a little silence, and then the Muslim said: "We will always call you 'Sister,' because it is a title of great respect and more than respect. We all look on you as our sister because of what you have done for us, and because you have taught us that men and women can be brothers and sisters no matter who they are or what their position or race. So please request the colonel sahib that we may continue to call you 'Sister.'" I may add, in parenthesis, that I asked the colonel no such thing, as the professional Sisters naturally feel very strongly on this point, which has done much to create a prejudice against voluntary nurses in military hospitals in India.

I did not mean this talk to be so personal, and to some it may seem sentimental. But in thinking and talking of India I can only speak from my heart. Now and again I look back and wonder, "What have I done in twenty years to give back a little of all the happiness and interest that India has given to me?" And I honestly think that the realization of having been called "Sister" by every sort of Indian from Peshawar to Cape Cormorin is my answer. I admit I am proud of it, and I have friends and kindred spirits who have had similar experiences and feel the same. I offer the idea of service and brotherhood and example, with genuine humility, as constructive suggestions towards solving our present discontents. They are not new ideas to us in India, but ones which the present generation of ordinary individuals has either forgotten or never learnt.

DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER

A MEETING of the Association was held at the Caxton Hall, Caxton Street, S.W. 1, on Tuesday, May 25, 1943, when Mrs. Iris Portal read a paper entitled "Individual Responsibility in India." Lady (James) Grigg occupied the chair.

The CHAIRMAN said that when she went to India in 1934 a wise friend told her that it required a man of culture not only to avoid being frozen stiff but to animate the very forms themselves with a humane and rich humanity. One had no choice in other people's houses, but in one's own country one was queen and could demonstrate friendliness rather than official dignity; more important than all the trimmings was to do a job of work for India and to refuse to sell one's soul and gifts to a routine of mass-produced functions.

She thought that was good advice, and it was advice which her husband and herself had tried, sometimes unsuccessfully, to follow. She would not set herself up to be an expert on India as she was only there for five years, and for a good deal of the time lived on a red carpet and had very little first-hand experience of life in the districts or in the villages. She had only time to learn a smattering of the language. Nowadays this might not be a disqualification for dogmatizing on Indian problems, quite the reverse; the less one knew the more one had to say. This was true of most things in these days of vocal self-consciousness, and her excuse for taking the chair was one of friendship with Mrs. Portal and because she sympathized with what she was going to say. She would like to call her "Iris Butler," because Butler was a household name in India, and there was no need to mention the services given by that family to a people whom they loved.

One of the most cherished things she brought back from India was a letter written by the landlord of one of the many houseboats at Kashmir: "I bear this in my mind that our houseboats were engaged by kings; please give our best salaams to sahib with our folded hands." This was a compliment and a challenge, and she left it to Mrs. Portal to answer the challenge.

Mrs. PORTAL then read her paper.

Dr. ALICE PENNELL said that in assessing the values of post-war things she thought that the greatest gain would be the abolition of the Hitler mentality—a complex from which we all suffered. Those in India should have been ready for the implications of this kind of mentality, because of the caste system, but unfortunately their temperaments developed along other lines, and they had become tolerant instead of fighting against this system. As they had grown towards the idea of real democracy, which was Britain's present substitute for nineteenth-century imperialism, they had come to see that wherever the superiority complex existed it had to be fought against, and that was what we had to learn after this war—not only that in India there should not be people thought of as untouchable, but also in their relations with the people who went there from other countries. If the fight for freedom was a real issue in the Allied Nations it had to be real freedom which did not discriminate against certain groups of people, because they came from a caste or a country which was not their own.

Mrs. Portal had given a vision of what could be achieved between the peoples of the two countries if service and not domination was the inspiring force. Many realized how Englishwomen went to India with no knowledge of its history or peoples, but they changed rapidly when they were given work to do for the people. The speaker was delighted with Mrs. Portal's recipe for solving the difficulty—the idea of service. This had been the ideal of Great Britain for centuries; it was the motto of the Prince of Wales; when one tried to rule without having learnt to serve, mistakes were inevitable. Mrs. Portal had shown how service opened the door and made anything that happened afterwards important and of value.

Those in India had much to learn; they were fighting with the Allies for freedom

and democracy—words which struck a true note—a note which would work in with all the harmonies of a new world only if they had ears to hear and hearts to understand.

Major-General Sir ERNEST BRADFIELD said that he had just returned from India, having been there on a mission. He had seen many hospitals, and the view of the Commander-in-Chief and his staff was that hospitals for Indian soldiers should be equal to those which were provided for the British troops—no higher standard could be set. One must realize that there were difficulties in India. Before the war in the whole of the country there were only 5,000 nurses, but a great deal had been done, and he saw some of the magnificent work carried on by the auxiliary nursing services, amongst them being English ladies who had taken part in the work of the hospitals. A number of Queen Alexandra's Indian military nurses were helping to run the Indian troop hospitals.

An enormous improvement had been made in three years and more was being done, not only for treatment but in services such as rehabilitation centres. He saw Indian hospitals in the Middle East and Indian field ambulances side by side with British field ambulances, the Indian comparing most favourably with the British.

As a result of the mission, there would now be an Indian Army Medical Corps on the same lines as the R.A.M.C., not to provide a better career for Indian officers, but to provide a really homogeneous service which would have properly trained personnel, both men and nurses. A great deal was being done to make the hospital system for Indian troops equal to that for British troops.

Mr. C. W. WADDINGTON, C.I.E., said that there were two points which occurred to him in listening to a very excellent lecture which seemed to strike a jarring note. The first was that the lecturer held that a great deal of the misunderstanding between British and Indians was due to the behaviour of British women in India. This seemed unfair because the medical missionaries and many other women in India had devoted themselves to the service of the country, and among the officers' wives many had done their best to maintain and foster good feeling between the two races. British women in India suffered many difficulties; they generally went out without any knowledge of the language or of the customs, but he did not believe it was fair to say that they were the chief factor, or, indeed, any factor which created ill-will between the two races.

There was one other point which concerned the Indian Army. The lecturer said that we did not send to India the pick of our young men as officers in the Army. It was well known that in the old days the British officer in the Indian Army was a picked man; they had only to remember the way in which Indian soldiers had followed their lead in Tunisia, Burma and elsewhere to repudiate any slur cast upon the British officer in India. At the present time, of course, officers could not be selected or trained as carefully as formerly. They were taken from the desk or bench and pitchforked into the Army, but he did not believe that these young officers would prove any more lacking in leadership than the regular officers of the Indian Army.

With regard to the general question of the feeling between the two races and the necessity for working together, no thinking man at the present time could help feeling that the only sure hope for India was to go forward with Dominion status, in partnership with the other nations of the Commonwealth. That was what we worked for, and we should not do any good to that cause by finding fault or cavilling at people who were doing their very best to bring that about.

Mrs. G. H. BELL said that Mrs. Portal had moved her gracious ways about India: she had nursed the wounded, made friends where friends were needed and had come home animated with the desire to promote good feeling. But when talking to friends one could go further in criticism than when standing on a platform. One had to be careful in that case not to cast a general slur upon reputations which were precious to those who carried on. No women had ever been so tried in our generation as the community of British women in the East. Had they not suffered enough in Hong Kong, Malaya and Burma? When there was an opportunity of speaking

of their far more fortunate sisters in India surely everyone in England would wish to pay a generous tribute to the work they did and the things they stood for. Who were they? Viceroys' wives in long succession, wives of governors, of judges, of newspaper men, missionaries, doctors, nurses, officers' wives and the wives of other ranks. How often in the past had she heard people say, "The men in India are splendid; but, my dear, the women!" She had been bored with it and would be to the end of her days, and now, when British women in India were anxious over their husbands fighting in Tunisia, Burma and elsewhere, was the time when Mrs. Portal should wish to invite such a meeting to send them a message of pride and faith, and to express our determination to uphold their customs and their conduct in the face of the enemy that stood at the gate of India.

Although Mrs. Portal had criticized the women severely she had also criticized the men. She had asked whether British officers in the Indian Army were properly prepared for the work they had to do. England, unfortunately, never gave any military training until the enemy was at the door. Mrs. Bell suggested that Mrs. Portal should ask the Indian soldiers of the Fourth Indian Division, and the men who fought with General Wingate in Burma, their opinion of the quality of the leadership given them by their British officers. Mrs. Bell said she quarrelled quite seriously with Mrs. Portal when she spoke of but "few" men and women of goodwill in India today. For who were the men in India? Were the majority of men at Army headquarters, judges of the high courts, schoolmasters, missionaries, journalists, planters, civil servants, police officers, and men in the ranks of the Army, men of ill-will? Of course not. Mrs. Portal had also said that the few who possessed goodwill were striving to improve the available material, and it was not the best. The material which probably reinforced the British leadership in the Indian Army today came from the banks, from behind the counter, from planters, and from evacuees from Burma and Malaya. It was not trained material, but it was the same raw material that had kept this island unconquered for a thousand years. Today the young and valiant gave their lives on every front, and were we to put bitterness into the cup of sorrow which their wives and mothers must drink by decrying their husbands and sons?

Mrs. Portal's remarks might do this much good, that they would arouse in every warm and magnanimous heart a determination to uphold the reputation of British women in India and to express their complete confidence in the splendid leadership of British officers in the Indian Army.

Squadron-Leader ROGER FALK said that he was in India only a matter of days ago—for such were the remarkable feats of civil aviation—and he was quite unashamedly and unrepentantly a firm believer in the power and value, properly directed, of individual effort. He was impatient of the morass of dogma, slogan and cliché into which Indian affairs—and particularly relationships between Indians and British—had fallen. Nothing would be gained and no future assured if we were to depend on soulless, unimaginative and unreal formulæ. They must never eliminate the one vital fact that warmth of understanding and mutual respect could and did produce personal friendships, personal efforts and personal contacts.

So far as Mrs. Portal was prepared to concede inevitable handicaps of language, shyness and personal anxieties and responsibility—as long as she conceded all that he could support her.

But he asked her and all present to follow him for a moment into village India. In Eastern Bengal they could see fraternization—spontaneous and unself-conscious—going on between British troops and Indian villagers. Here at least could be seen the true spirit of this age, for there was no prejudice, no preconceived notions, dividing these ordinary simple people from each other.

The picture he tried to give in a recent broadcast of the fraternization aspect of our troops' lives brought an interesting response from parents, wives and sweethearts of men who were now serving in India, who wrote letters showing that among ordinary folk there was not anything but a warm desire to co-operate and understand.

He was quite certain that this sense of personal dual responsibility, as he said in his broadcast, firstly to put out the lamps of evil and secondly to honour a commonwealth responsibility, was being appreciated by the ever-growing numbers of British

troops in India. There were, of course, the grumblers who wrote to their families and said how much they disliked it all—the dirt, the heat, the poverty and the deceit—but those people would grumble anywhere.

He felt that the effect of this service in India on the minds of hundreds of young men who had sensed something of India's problem would have an immense consequence after the war when they returned home, or, as some might do, if they settled down there.

He thought Mrs. Portal had been a little unkind and a little sweeping in her criticism of her sex. She was, after all, at home again, and there was no place like home, be it London or the Northern Punjab. He was greatly impressed during all the months he was in India this time by the efforts, which were gathering considerable tempo, that were being made by European women (often long overdue for home leave or even a change of air in the hills) to identify themselves with India's war effort and, no matter what colour or creed the community, dedicated to winning the war in which they found themselves, getting down to it with humour and patience. They could not be smug or complacent about this, but they could say that such personal example could do more than a hundred Government of India Acts or a thousand debates in the House of Commons or the Central Legislative Assembly.

Mrs. STENT said that she agreed with Mrs. Portal that it was the lack of knowledge of the language which was the great drawback to ordinary friendship. Most Indian women spoke English, and girls who went out just married did not attempt to learn the language and really get close to India and make the permanent friendships among the Indian women as they did with other Englishwomen. She herself was in the Central Provinces where everyone was very friendly, but it was very easy to make mistakes due to lack of knowledge of language or customs. It made all the difference to be in India as a child; it was then like going home to go out as a bride, and that might have prejudiced Mrs. Portal in one way. She was quite certain that lack of knowledge of the language was the great stumbling-block to friendship between the women of both races.

Mr. R. A. WILSON said that there was one criticism which he must make of the paper. Mrs. Portal spoke of a note of complacency regarding India amongst people interested in India in this country. He was aware that he was verging upon the political, but he did not think he could allow that statement to pass without protest because he thought it was very far from being true. People interested in India were sorely puzzled; they might feel sad because the standards of administration which had been built up during the last hundred years were in danger of falling away, but they also felt that it was inevitable. They were certainly very far from being complacent.

With regard to the other point which had been the great theme of Mrs. Portal's paper—what she had called the obscuring of the human values—he hesitated to say anything about it because Mrs. Portal only returned from India five months ago while he left India sixteen years ago, returning for a few months five years ago. Five years was a long time, but it was certainly not his feeling five years ago that there was any obscuring of human values. In his own Province the standard as regards intimacy between officials and Indians was, he thought, higher than in any other Province, and perhaps it was unwise to generalize from that. He had, however, travelled over a good deal of India and did not get the impression that there was any such obscuration.

He spent a week-end watching a collector talking to his villagers as one man to another, and when he called on one Deputy Commissioner he found him in happy conversation with a prominent member of the Congress Party whom he had sentenced a year or two previously to two years' imprisonment. The fact that he had done so made no difference to their relations; when the same gentleman was released from gaol he went to have breakfast with another Deputy Commissioner. In India there was, as it were, a split personality in the case of officials; a man was Deputy Commissioner and he was also Smith, Jones or Robinson, and his position depended entirely on what Smith, Jones or Robinson was. He often had to say very hard

things to Indians, but if they were treated with courtesy and dignity they did not feel any resentment whatever. He was sure that this would be confirmed by those who had had district experience.

The speaker was inclined to think that Mrs. Portal had been hard on English-women in India. Most of them could remember cases which would support her hypothesis, but they could remember many cases which would oppose it. Women, both old and young, were taking up work in hospitals with the greatest zeal, and doing what they could to get under the skins of the men who were being treated by them.

He was very glad that Mrs. Portal had the courage to tell the moving story of what was said to her in the hospital. Most of them could tell similar stories of such incidents, and they would always remain as treasured memories. They should be very grateful to her for her paper.

Mr. EDWIN HAWARD thought that Mrs. Portal was trying, and, in his opinion very rightly, to shock them into noticing a very important factor in relations with India, and that was the need for seeing that those who went out to India to work or to serve should have a background of knowledge of the country before they went. Mrs. Portal's paper had done a good service in bringing this home. He had lived in two international centres of the world—Geneva and Shanghai. It was not difficult for certain sections of the community, but it was difficult for the rank and file. In Shanghai he found that the British kept with the British, the French with the French, and very often this was due to economic causes. He did not think they were so bad at learning languages, but the truth of the matter was that there was not opportunity for testing everybody's ability in that respect. He thought they should guard themselves against sweeping charges, and on the general question he thoroughly agreed with Mr. Wilson regarding women in the Far East and in India. Even in this country there were women who were not doing a hand's turn for the war, but they were the exceptions which proved the rule for the rest, and possibly it was the exceptions which Mrs. Portal had met.

Mrs. VERA HANNAY said that Mrs. Portal had raised points on which strong differences of opinion leading to controversy emerged. She (the speaker) did not claim to be anything more than a fair sample of hundreds of Englishwomen who had passed varied and interesting years in India—that great country with a great future. She would be a humbug if she did not state quite clearly that as the wife of a serving officer in India she felt that her primary duty was to run his house efficiently and comfortably for him. Personal responsibility started with one's own private obligations.

At the same time any woman, however average, ought to be attracted in India by the great interest of the country, with its ancient past, and the strivings of the people for advancement. Her impression was that the reluctance sometimes shown by both British and Indian to get together was often due to a sort of shyness on both sides, for when friendships were formed they were lasting and sincere ones.

She would like to underline Mrs. Portal's remarks about the Indian Army, for she believed that in the matter of companionship-in-arms barriers were much more easily knocked down than elsewhere. She noticed during nearly twenty years in India, slowly but surely from the point of view of regimental life, warm understanding between the wives of Indian and British officers was developing.

She did not believe that Indo-British relations would ever flourish if there was a feeling of superiority on either side. It was not always the fact, as people in England seemed to believe, and as the music hall often suggested, that the fault laid entirely or even mainly with the British element.

From reports she had from people now in India, or who had lately returned to this country, she believed that a more effective bond of understanding was being forged as a result of the Japanese menace and the very essential co-operation that war produced. When bombs fell in Calcutta they did not discriminate between Indians and British; and might they not hope that a love of freedom which was shared by both peoples would result in a permanent quickening of friendly personal relations?

Mrs. PORTAL, in replying on the discussion, said that she would try to sum up all she had learnt from the criticisms and also to try to put in a nutshell what she meant on this question of human values. A distinguished member of a medical mission had been able to give details of the Indian military hospitals. She was glad that the men of goodwill, whom she contended were not any too many in India, had been so successful in spite of not having any great scope or good material. She had an enormous respect for Mrs. Bell's feelings, and she was distressed that she had wounded her so deeply, and others in the audience who felt as Mrs. Bell felt. Several speakers had mentioned the work of missionary ladies in India, and there she could give her wholehearted agreement; they were the most wonderful people. She had worked with five or six denominations and had the great privilege of seeing their work at first hand. The subject of British women in India was a difficult and controversial one; as she had said, this was not quite the audience which she expected to address if she had any opportunity to speak, and it was much more to her own contemporaries to whom she wished to address these criticisms. She had hoped her hearers would realize that things were not as they had been when they were working in India; they were not; and that was the whole meaning of what she was trying to say. She had chosen her words with the utmost care. On the question of complacency, she was deeply moved by some of the words spoken that afternoon, but she did think there was a certain atmosphere of outraged virtue.

As a final summing-up, all she would emphasize was the expression used by one speaker, "trying to identify themselves," which was used in relation to the war effort. "Trying to identify" oneself was quite different from imposing oneself, and it seemed to her that a great deal of splendid work done in India had been spoilt and not come to fruition because it had been imposed upon and not identified with the country and people. She felt most strongly that, unless we could in the future live the same kind of life and have the same kind of feelings in India as we would in our own villages at home, and go forward with the people of India, hand-in-hand, it would be much better to quit India tomorrow. This was the foundation of everything she had tried to say.

As to the question of whether the best type of people to officer the Indian Army were being used, it was not for her, as a woman, to give opinions on military training. What she meant was leadership and understanding and everything that was required of an officer by his men. There, again, she was in a difficulty; she could give chapter and verse for her criticisms, but she could not do so in that meeting. That was, however, her opinion, and the opinion of others who were at present engaged on active service with Indian troops, that they were not getting the best type of officer, and it was not fair, because they were such splendid troops.

She thanked her audience for their courtesy and kindness in listening, and she hoped they realized she was trying to bring back the point of view of her generation who loved India and who felt that there was no reason why we should not go forward together to a glorious future.

Sir GILBERT WILES, though not in agreement with all the views of the lecturer, proposed a hearty vote of thanks to Mrs. Portal for her "thoughtful and courageous paper." This was seconded by Sir JOHN WOODHEAD and accorded by applause.

AMERICA, BRITAIN AND INDIA

By HENRY S. L. POLAK

THE newcomer to America is immediately impressed with an ardent realism which is registered by the Press and platform alike. Appeals to the American concept of freedom and liberty resound everywhere and upon every public occasion. "The citizen is always made conscious of "the American way of life." It is this constant emphasis upon noble purposes, this generous enthusiasm for high ideals, which has done so much to harmonize the many different and separate elements in the country's

life and has helped to develop at an increasing tempo a sense of American nationhood which, only a generation ago, seemed far distant from realization and which is now of immense promise in the common task of world reconstruction.

Parallel with this idealism, which sometimes shows itself in strange and contradictory ways, is a practical shrewdness, at times narrow and selfish, at other times establishing the balance between theory and practice. The contradictions in American life are thus frequent and often violent. It is, therefore, difficult for the visitor—even when born and bred in a culture which is, in spite of modifications and changes, the root and background of American culture—to generalize about American thought and opinion. These vary widely according to region and experience, according to tradition and inheritance, according to occasion and impulse.

The war has done much and is doing ever more to modify certain phases and aspects of American idealism. Thus, isolationism has become increasingly unpopular, and it should, in spite of the probable reaction of post-war fatigue, be well on the way to disappearance, as it has long since been in this country. We can see a twofold result. On the one hand is a growing willingness to accept responsibility, proportionate to America's strategic importance in the world of the future and to her superlative participation in the war effort, for the common preparation by the United Nations of plans for post-war reconstruction of a necessarily global character.

On the other hand, there emerges in some influential quarters an over-readiness to assert a right to interfere in the affairs of others without an adequate equipment of knowledge and experience. These elements claim to have all the answers to all the questions, and so tend to embarrass international relations, and especially those with Britain, towards whom they are generally hypercritical. In no matter is this critical tendency more prominently or embarrassingly displayed than in the denunciation of what is popularly spoken of as "British imperialism"—a denunciation which ignores the entire history of the last forty years and the changes that are proceeding even as the words are pronounced, and which ignores equally certain imperialist tendencies in American life itself. And in no aspect of Britain's imperial relations is it more formidably and aggressively expressed than on the subject of India.

"MISINTERPRETATION"

In the first of a series of articles contributed to *The Times* in 1930, at the conclusion of a lecture tour in the United States, Mr. Edward Thompson wrote :

"The British public . . . does not realize how intense is the interest felt by America in the Indian situation. As an Englishman temporarily in America I have been dragged into the controversy. . . . Very greatly to my surprise I have found myself defending the Indian Government, an experience which had befallen other Englishmen by no means of the 'imperialist' type. The difficulty is not to get a fair hearing, but to correct the mass of misinterpretation that underlies American thought about India.

"Everywhere is the belief that history runs along a few regular lines liable to repetition : the events of 1776 are being re-enacted in India; there is a Congress there with a President; there has been a salt-tax agitation, which is the Stamp Act agitation over again; there has been a National Day of Independence. The struggle is further simplified into one between a Saint and an Empire; what Mr. Gandhi says or does is right and not to be questioned, what he wishes 'India wishes.' . . .

"That pride makes us hold on, that deep economic interests make us hold on; this is believed. . . . The economics of the Indian situation cannot be explained by an Englishman except on the platform. The Press has not the space for corrections. The British case has to go by default. . . ."

Referring to an appeal in behalf of Indian independence signed by a number of well-known American "liberals," Mr. Thompson, after analysing the queer but characteristic mixture of specious theory and distorted facts of which it was composed, says :

"These distinguished leaders of American thought see fit to disfranchise all except the Extremist Wing, evidently holding that a majority (the Muslims, the

Princes, the Liberals, and many former Congress leaders) has no rights. . . . To its signatories this 'Appeal' seems an incontrovertible document. . . . They assume as beyond controversy a number of highly controversial points. Under the guise of impartiality they judge a case against a nation which has given America many proofs of its deep friendliness and desire for good relations. . . . Throughout the controversy many American newspapers have upheld their own high traditions of fairness. But the 'liberal' Press has been solely unfair."

British speakers and writers who have since visited the United States and have become familiar with this attitude towards Britain have been confronted with this same problem, deeply affecting Anglo-American relations—and never more so than now when we are Allies engaged in a mortal conflict with the common enemies of freedom, whether in the East or the West. It is an attitude which stands in the way of a better understanding between the two great nations and of a warm, firm and intimate mutual confidence.

Early in my recent visit to the States I was warned of this censorious attitude in certain circles of opinion, based upon ignorance, prejudice or propagandist misinformation, by Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe, a former editor of the Calcutta *Statesman*. He was my immediate predecessor as editor, during the last war, of *India*, the London organ of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress under Sir William Wedderburn's chairmanship. No Englishman can speak with higher authority on the American point of view.

As recently as last November, at the end of a short visit to America, Mr. Kingsley Martin, one of the best known of our anti-imperialists, called attention to this unpleasant feature of Anglo-American relations. In an article in *The Nation* (New York) he says :

"I must confess to an impatience with American critics of British policy in India who imagine that the Indian Congress is an elected body similar to the elected body of the same name in Washington, who argue about a solution for India without having heard of Pakistan, and who completely forget, in demanding freedom for Indians, to inquire into the interests of the Depressed Classes or of other minorities. I really believe that many who are vehement about India have in their minds an analogy with eighteenth-century America. They ask why Britain does not 'quit India,' oblivious of the fact that at the present time all the Indian parties, including Congress, agree in wanting Britain to defend India. Some knowledge, I suggest, is a necessary basis for the discussion of any subject, even of British imperialism. . . .

"I recognize among the various types of Britain's critics some who are not inspired by genuine liberalism. I can take anything from informed critics who care about the liberty they demand. But sometimes I detect not so much an interest in India or in winning the war for the United Nations as a groping toward an alternative imperialism that might easily prove no more decent and liberal than Britain's."

There has been growing suspicion in Congress circles and among Indian business interests, voiced in unambiguous terms just before his arrest by Mr. Gandhi, that American concern in India's political affairs, the presence of American troops in India and the engagement of American technicians in Indian war-plants, may presage an American imperialism designed to replace or to supplement British imperialism. This has been one of the factors which have helped of late to damp down the tendency, earlier manifested in the States, in the Press and on the platform, to demand intervention in the ominous situation in India created by the outbreak of widespread sabotage following upon the detention of Mr. Gandhi and other well-known Congress leaders.

Mr. Emery Reves, in his recent book, *A Democratic Manifesto*, deals incidentally and from another angle (as I have myself done repeatedly) with these suspicions of American and British motives. He remarks penetratingly :

"We have seen Russia building in twenty years an industrial organization which took England, the United States and Germany more than a century to

build up. This 'miracle' will certainly shortly be repeated in India and in China. We cannot stop this evolution and cannot endeavour to keep industrial power concentrated in the hands of certain individuals, certain corporations, or certain nations by artificial means. Such an attempt would almost certainly lead to explosions."

And however much Mr. Wendell Willkie may have evoked criticism by his easy assurance, after a rapid flight to and from China (without visiting India), as to what "the average man in Asia" demands, he has rendered a valuable service to both the East and the West in his newly published book, *One World*, in emphasizing Mr. Reves' warning.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE

Another element in the cooling off of emotional appeals for American intervention in Indo-British affairs or for India's immediate independence has been the warning of better-informed American publicists, some of them distinguished Liberals like Mr. Herbert Agar—who has pointed out that, very important as the Congress Party is, it cannot pretend, except upon an authoritarian basis, to represent all India, and that, in fact, it cannot even honestly claim to speak for a majority—Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr and Mr. Walter Lippmann. Major George Fielding Elliot has stressed India's strategic importance to the United Nations, as well as her important and varied military contribution willingly given and constantly increasing, and has reminded his countrymen and thinking Indians alike of "the curiously unrealistic demands of Mr. Gandhi and the All-India Congress leaders." The well-known radio commentators, Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn and Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, and the widely read columnist, Miss Dorothy Thompson, have spoken on the same lines, as well as the increasing number of well-informed contributions from India of American news correspondents, such as Mr. Edgar Snow, Mr. Herbert Matthews and Miss C. K. Cumming, after careful and widespread investigations.

These are in striking contrast with earlier pontifical utterances, such as those of Mr. Louis Fischer, who somehow managed to give his readers the impression that he was actually at the centre of events at the time of the Cripps visit to India, whereas he did not reach the country until several weeks later. After a certain amount of inquiry, and whilst largely under the influence of a highly emotional regard for Mr. Gandhi (with whom he spent a whole week), he declared, contrary to all the facts known to participants in the Cripps negotiations, that the mission had been deliberately sabotaged from Whitehall, apart from what he described as the "inherent insincerity" of the proposals. Mr. Graham Syry, Professor Coupland and others, who sought to undo the mischief wrought by Mr. Fischer's throbbing and partisan articles in the American Press, helped to place the situation in a more realistic perspective; but it is always difficult to catch up with this kind of misrepresentation. It has a peculiar fascination for those who, with almost no historic background, cannot think of Indo-British relations otherwise than as a sustained attempt by Britain to confuse opinion in India and abroad with a view to the maintenance of her grip on India.

OTHER WRITERS

Equally important, from the point of view of the better information of the American public, have been the contributions to fact and to realism by British publicists such as Mr. Bertrand Russell, whose ultra-liberalism is unimpeachable; Sir Norman Angell, whose new book, *Let the People Know*, deserves another Nobel Prize. He has rendered an invaluable service to Anglo-American understanding in his analysis of American concepts of British "colonialism" and by his lucid demonstration of the sustained and constantly accelerating process of de-imperialization both in India and in the British Colonial Empire; similarly, Lord Hailey's important article, "India in the Modern World," in the April, 1942, issue of the American quarterly review, *Foreign Affairs*, brilliantly illuminates the subject of Indo-British political and economic relations today. The Indian Section of the British Information Services has helped invaluable by furnishing accurate facts which requested.

Yet another—and perhaps an even more valuable—factor has been the contributions of American scholars like Professor Alan Nevins of Columbia University and Mr. James Trulow Adams, who have constantly drawn their compatriots' attention to the immense complexity of the Indian problem, the difficulty of its quick solution, and the desirability of sympathetic and constructive thought, rather than criticism, in the efforts by British and Indian leaders alike to find a solution that would contain within its framework the elements of unity and stability.

Another independent writer is Dr. Gustav Stolper, a Swiss educated in Germany and now an American citizen. In *This Age of Fable* he has dealt faithfully with a well-known American impressionist writer who had described British economic relations with India as "booty, loot."

Dr. Stolper writes pungently :

"Now, finally, he has made his meaning clear : investment equals booty, loot. Never mind that this investment (furnishing India with money on the favourable terms of British guaranteed credit, the cheapest in all Asia) is shown . . . to have created 'by far the largest irrigation system on earth,' which is 'important because it abolished threat of famine,' and 'a colossal railway system in which alone £150,000,000 of British capital is invested. Indian railways carry over 500,000,000 people a year.' 'If China possessed a system of communications like that of India, the history of China in recent years would have been very different. . . . Well, better stick to famine, floods, internal wars, defencelessness against foreign aggressors, rather than be preserved by 600 Englishmen and the British Navy!'"

Nor can I omit reference to the admirable service to India, Britain and America by Indian speakers such as the Indian Agent-General, Sir Girja Bajpai, Sir Firoz Khan Noon, Sir Samuel and Lady Runganadhan, Begum Shah Nawaz, Sir Rama-swami Mudaliar and Sir Zafrullah Khan. Another distinguished Indian contributor is the well-known journalist Mr. T. A. Raman, whose book, *What Does Gandhi Want?* contains a valuable collection of accurate and recent material revealing the workings and the changes of the Mahatma's mind on a variety of controversial subjects, upon many of which he often appears to speak under the influence of others no better informed thereon and not seldom a great deal less sincere.

A LECTURE TOUR IN CANADA

I come now to my own modest contribution to the promotion of better Anglo-American understanding. It resulted from my offer, with that object in view, in the middle of 1940, to undertake an unofficial and personal lecture tour in America dealing with India and the war. I had thought my past career would be recognized. I was in the most intimate and trusted collaboration with Mr. Gandhi throughout the last ten years of his South African period, during which I shared the sorrows and sufferings of his countrymen as though they had been my own. Then there were my close association with him, Gokhale, C. F. Andrews and one or two others in the long campaign for the abolition of the evil system of indentured labour; my somewhat unique contacts in various capacities with Indian affairs, mostly from "the inside" of Indian social and political life, over a period of nearly forty years. All these considerations, I had thought, might spare me the imputation of being "a notorious British imperialist" and a "thinly disguised British official spokesman." But I had reckoned without the sustained efforts of hostile influences in England and America which prevented my reaching the States until late in 1941.

In the interval I spent some months in Canada, where I lectured and broadcast largely under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. My talks in the Dominion were well received by an Empire community which had known how to reach agreement between its divergent linguistic, cultural and religious elements and thereby to achieve its present status of equal partnership with Britain and the other Dominions in terms of the Statute of Westminster.

Incidentally, Sir Norman Angell relates how almost impossible he has found it to convince American audiences of the "intelligentsia" type of the factual character and the substantial reality of Dominion independence, including the right of secession

from the British Commonwealth. They listen almost with incredulity when reminded that the King of Canada, advised by his Canadian Ministers, did not declare war against Germany until some days after the King of England had been similarly advised by his British Ministers, and that the King of Canada, again as advised by his Canadian Ministers, declared war against Japan some days before the King of England, similarly advised by his British Ministers, did so. They are sure that there must be a snag in it somewhere. For the British imperialists are far too smart to have surrendered their right and power to exploit a British territory! Indeed, there seems to be something of an inferiority complex in this suspicion and even fear on the part of some Americans of being "out-smarted" by the subtle British!

My Canadian audiences, however, were genuinely and sympathetically interested in my objective description of the steps that were taken in, and have been continued since, 1917 by British and Indian leaders alike to enable India to reach the same status of equal partnership in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Equally interested were they to learn that the only Indian leader who, from actual personal experience in one of the overseas British territories, had had the advantage of observing the circumstances and methods of the transfer of power from Britain first to a self-governing colony and later to an autonomous and independent Dominion (though without having appreciably benefited from his opportunity) was Mr. Gandhi himself.

I also took occasion to raise with the Provincial Government of British Columbia, within whose immediate function the matter lay, and with the Dominion Government, who, however, had no jurisdiction to legislate independently, the question of the status of the British Indian community of about 1,000 (mostly Sikhs) in the Province, who are still deprived of every franchise—municipal, provincial and Dominion alike—in common with other Orientals, whether British or not, and whether or not born in the Province. Unfortunately, just when there seemed to be a possibility that the question might be favourably considered by the Provincial and Dominion Governments, the tragedy of Pearl Harbour occurred, releasing much pent-up (and hardly concealed in normal times) anti-Oriental feeling on the Pacific Coast, both in Canada and in America. Fortunately, that veteran of Indian experience, Sir Robert Holland, who now resides in retirement at Victoria, Vancouver Island, is keeping India's flag flying, and the matter will be raised again, I am sure, whenever a suitable occasion presents itself.

INDIAN PROPAGANDISTS IN U.S.A.

My subsequent tour in the United States lasted for some fourteen months, and I thus had an invaluable opportunity of learning something of American-British relations and of familiarizing myself with the general American point of view at first-hand. It has been a great privilege for me and I have returned with a very great and growing admiration for the American people. But I am bound to confess that I soon discovered for myself that much of what Mr. Edward Thompson had described in 1930 remained substantially true, especially as regards the attitude of the so-called Liberals.

They are, however, not altogether to be blamed. With rare exceptions they have had no contact, direct or indirect, with Indian affairs. They have depended for years almost unquestioningly upon the distortions of Indian history and of Indo-British political and economic relations presented to them skilfully and eloquently in a variety of ways mainly by embittered Indian propagandists. These have usually and voluntarily exiled themselves from their Motherland since early youth and mostly have no intention of returning there to play their part in their country's emancipation from the so much disliked British rule. Even when at home they had very limited experience of Indian social, economic and political conditions, and they have since obviously done little to broaden their knowledge and bring it up to date. Being themselves emotionally overwrought, they have eagerly appreciated and taken advantage of the sympathetic but uncritical response to their tragic tales of unrelieved British oppression on the part of their American hearers, often brought up on an emotional dietary of ill-digested Anglo-American history and other complicated prejudices.

Without discounting their very real patriotism, I cannot help feeling that many

of these propagandists have none too scrupulously capitalized upon this emotionalism, accompanied as it is so frequently by an almost incredible ignorance of even elementary facts relating to India. One well-known Indian writer and lecturer, having familiarized himself with American political phraseology, uses his peculiar facility of speech to flatter his audiences by reminding them of the services rendered to the Republic by its "Founding Fathers," and so draws an immediate and sympathetic response to his obvious analogy with Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Nehru and their colleagues. He has no knowledge whatever of the immense contributions, long before their advent upon the political scene, to the task of nation-building made by modern India's real "Founding Fathers"—Dadabhai Naoroji, W. C. Bonnerjee, Surendranath Banerjea, Ranade, Phirozeshah Mehta, Gokhale, Subrahmanya Aiyar, Badruddin Tyebji and other pioneers, not to forget their British collaborators: Hume, Cotton, Wedderburn and Annie Besant. Even Tilak is forgotten.

Another Indian spokesman as constantly uses familiar American democratic terminology, but is discreetly silent regarding the authoritarian practices of the "High Commands" of the major political parties. A third, whilst in private conversation agreeing that it was a first-class blunder that the Cripps proposals were rejected, does not hesitate to belittle them in public, and recently explained in 6,000 words, in a well-known anti-British "liberal" magazine, the many excellent reasons for regarding those proposals as a fraud and a delusion and for justifying their rejection. A fourth delights to denounce the political opponents of the Congress Party as traitors to the country and to "smear" those participating in the Viceroy's Council as the British Viceroy's "stooges." Incidentally, the Viceroy's Council is persistently and almost invariably spoken of as "the British Government," and few seem to realize that it is composed of ten Indians (out of fifteen members) drawn from public life, some of them former members of the Congress Party. When this fact is noted, "hand-picked" is the least of the contemptuous terms applied to them.

BRITISH PLEDGES

These and other propagandists have for years had the field almost entirely to themselves, for most British speakers, who have only a general knowledge of Indian affairs, are ill-equipped to answer the many misstatements or to place the facts in anything like their right proportions. The anti-British propagandists have persistently sought to justify extremism and intransigence in India by asserting that British promises are worthless. For were not firm promises of Dominion status, to become operative immediately thereafter, made by Britain during the last war, and were they not notoriously and flagrantly violated when the war was over and the need for Indian military and monetary assistance no longer existed? If you point to the actual language of the Montagu Declaration of 1917, insist that it was the only formal and binding pledge by Britain during the last war, and explain the steps taken to carry it out; if you show Indian reactions at the time and thereafter to have been mainly criticisms of its vagueness and indefiniteness and of Britain being the self-constituted judge of the rate of constitutional progress, and of the steps themselves as taken with too little imagination and over-cautiousness—"too little and too late"—you are met with blank bewilderment and even with incredulity on the part of many of your "liberal" hearers. They strongly suspect you of deliberately putting forward a pro-British or a legalistic case, however objectively you have sought to place before them the real facts and their accompanying circumstances.

MANIFESTO "SIGNATURES"

An interesting illustration of the irresponsibility of many Americans, quite honest and well-intentioned men and women, in dealing with Indian affairs came to my direct notice some months ago. There appeared in *The New York Times*, generally a friendly and sympathetic paper, a full-page advertisement containing a long and vigorous appeal to the American public (obviously at the suggestion of the India League of America) advocating American intervention to resolve the impasse in India following on the Cripps visit, since Indians could no longer be expected to believe British promises. For were not large promises made by Britain to India in

the last war, and was it not because India realized that nothing was done to implement them for two years after the war ended that her peoples had gone into rebellion?

The document was signed by some of the best-known and most highly respected Liberals, not one of whom, when his signature was sought, appeared to recall that no Indian of equal distinction has since 1921 been eligible for American citizenship, being a despised, disliked or distrusted Oriental. One of the signatories, a former missionary in India, whom I knew and whom I asked why he had signed such an appeal based on an obvious falsification of fact, at once admitted that, of course, the basic statement was untrue, and then somewhat shame-facedly added that he had not even read the document before authorizing the appending of his signature.

Another signatory was the eminent editor of a well-known Radical weekly and the New York correspondent of an even better-known English Liberal daily. I wrote to him asking him to quote to me the exact reference for the basic statement around which the appeal was built up. His reply amazed me, for he referred me to the author of the appeal, that well-known "authority" on Indian affairs—Mrs. Pearl Buck! Yet a third, a well-known lawyer, chanced to be my chairman at an important meeting in New York shortly after. In the course of my address I took the opportunity, without referring to him by name, to describe the falsehood and the fallacy underlying the appeal and to express my astonishment and indignation at the irresponsibility and the unjustifiable ignorance displayed in such critical times by its signatories, who were nevertheless seeking to change the face of history. At the close of the meeting, this gentleman returned to the platform and asked me in some confusion: "Did I sign *that*? I never even saw it!" I replied: "You surely did sign it. Now what are you going to do about it?" So far as I know, neither he nor any other of the signatories who had been approached by myself or by British friends ever publicly dissociated themselves from the statement. Perhaps it was too much to expect a public admission of error in such a matter—deeply though it might affect Anglo-American relations—from a group of well-meaning academic persons intellectually convinced of their right to assert binding opinions in matters of wide human relations and in the settlement of world problems. We have such persons among ourselves, so we need not be too censorious of others!

THE U.S.A. TOUR

During my fourteen months' stay in the country I toured widely—in the East, the Mid-West, the West and the deep South—giving lectures, group talks and radio addresses, and contributing occasionally to the daily and the periodical Press, seeking to place up-to-date facts before the public (usually completely ignorant of even the most elementary facts relating to India's magnificent war effort) and to correct loose writing and inaccurate statements on Indian affairs. My audiences were very varied both in size and quality. They included university and college gatherings—professors, lecturers and students; labour conferences; breakfast and luncheon clubs (Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis and others); professional and business groups (bankers, lawyers, engineers, men and women); religious gatherings; and special groups and conferences arranged by organizations of which I am a member in this country. I spoke from pulpit and platform and at round-table discussions, either alone or in debate. Frequently, being an Englishman, I was specially asked to put forward the specifically British viewpoint on Indian affairs. My radio talks were local, regional, nationwide and overseas. I interviewed personally many of the best-known and most influential columnists, editorial writers, public speakers and special correspondents dealing with world affairs, as well as radio commentators.

In general, I found the groups of business and professional people more satisfactory and responsive than the academic groups. The former, realizing that they had little factual knowledge of situations outside their ordinary experience, absorbed with avidity plain statements of fact put to them without rhetoric, in a reasonable perspective, dispassionately and in a non-partisan spirit. Accustomed as they were, by training and experience, to deal with the difficulties of human problems in the individual and in the larger society upon lines of trial and error, they would draw their own practical conclusions, without troubling about catchwords and without over-much theorizing, simplification or reference to inapplicable analogies.

THE ACADEMIC GROUPS

I must also admit, however, that the academic groups, too, always gave me a very friendly hearing. And here, too, especially in the light of Mr. Gandhi's repeated changes of mind and his unrealistic attitude when confronted with the prospect of his country's invasion and the final destruction of all her hopes and aspirations for generations to come, there has been a growing element of impatience and criticism concerning the unpractical and unstable handling of affairs by the Congress Party leadership and the intransigence of the Muslim League under Mr. Jinnah. Theoretical arguments for the immediate independence of India, the obvious absurdity of the "quit India" slogan, the sorry spectacle of widespread efforts to sabotage the war effort of the United Nations, with American soldiers, airmen and technicians actually in India and liable to bear the consequences, have made responsible American Liberals a great deal more cautious than formerly in assuming without examination that all the fault lay with the British and none with the noble protagonists of Indian freedom at the head of the major Indian parties.

As an illustration of this more cautious tendency I may point to the fact that I was able, in a short speech, to persuade the Student Debating Society of Yale University to reject a motion favouring American intervention in India. And I found a grateful response from his faculty colleagues when at another university I turned the tables somewhat ruthlessly upon one of the lecturers who had been notoriously anti-British. I have observed, too, a growing tendency to compare with the position and the aspirations of the Depressed Classes in India those of the Negroes of the Southern States, whose white people deeply resent Northern intervention in their colour problem. It has been an immense eye-opener to many to be shown the extent of the social revolution in India symbolized by the inclusion in the Viceroy's Council of an "Untouchable," sitting side by side and exercising powers equally with his high-caste compatriots. And I have been able to show convincingly, from the repeated statements of Mr. Gandhi himself during more than twenty years, and from those of other Indian leaders of varied political loyalties, that the communal problem is a very real one and not merely a British-created fiction, and that it has got steadily (and of late rapidly) worse within my own experience since I first visited India in 1909.

I have repeatedly—and latterly almost invariably—had the response from my audiences that they were grateful for my presentation of facts and circumstances (brought up to date and not twenty and more years old and now irrelevant) with which they had previously been unacquainted; that this work was of value in removing popular ignorance of a problem of unsuspected ramifications and complexity, and in helping to improve Anglo-American understanding; and that something like it should be continued in order to bring the two countries into a closer relationship by the removal of grounds of suspicion and by the establishment of a better appreciation of each other's difficulties.

Whilst the collapse of the rioting and the sabotage movement that followed upon Mr. Gandhi's arrest produced a definite muting of the interventionist slogans, emotion was again worked up widely by his recent fast, only to be lulled once more by its failure. Such emotional outbursts, however, are liable to recur and to raise a storm of passion and prejudice which, under the influence of propagandists, not all of them Indian patriots or misguided Liberals, but also enemy agents eagerly seeking to exploit seemingly favourable occasions to sow dissension between close allies, may easily take an unfriendly direction if not immediately and adequately countered.

THE NEED FOR ENLIGHTENMENT

In these circumstances it seems essential that those charged with the improvement of inter-Allied relations should send to or keep in the United States speakers and writers, British and Indian, official and unofficial, duly qualified to deal objectively and sympathetically with Indian national aspirations, to show what has been done by joint Indo-British effort to fulfil them, and to indicate clearly and sincerely what remains to be done, primarily by Indians themselves, to enable India to enjoy the independence under a constitution of her own devising which has been unambiguously promised her at the end of hostilities and has been repeated and reaffirmed

before a watching world by the highest British authorities speaking in the name and on behalf of the united British people of all parties.

Some of those high authorities should, in addition, remember that when addressing the British public, either through the Press, the platform, the broadcasting service or Parliament, they are also addressing America. They should, therefore, be extremely careful in the use of certain phrases, such as "the British Empire," which bear quite a different meaning there from what they do here, or which are liable to the interpretation of "what we have we hold." We have no need to invite the attribution of sinister or selfish motives on our part. But the days when the British Information Services felt obliged to go cautiously, lest they run the risk of being charged with propaganda agitation and of undue interference in America's internal affairs, are rapidly passing, and a much more courageous approach in the handling of this urgent situation is, in my opinion, called for and will really be widely welcomed in the United States. Our many friends there will be glad to have their hands strengthened.

Now that America is coming to realize a growing interest in the welfare of other peoples and is increasingly willing to participate in the creation of a new and true and stable world order, the greater is the sense of responsibility with which she is approaching her self-chosen task. In the paper read before this Association recently by Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, an interesting quotation was made from a statement of Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under-Secretary of State, a year ago, in which he rightly declared that the age of imperialism is ended. Just two months ago, Mr. Sumner Welles, replying to an appeal by Professor Perry, on behalf of certain groups and organizations, summed up the Indian situation and America's proper attitude towards it as follows :

" You also mention our 'failure to mediate in Indian affairs' as a criticism of the Department of State. The present military situation in the Far East is one in which all of us, including the people of India, face grave perils. The future constitutional status of India is a tremendously complicated and delicate problem. The United States Government is, of course, anxious to give full assistance to its solution. The people of India have been most solemnly assured that as soon as the necessities of war permit they will be given the opportunity to choose freely the form of government they desire. Wise men, vitally concerned both with the welfare of the people of India and with the defeat of our enemies, may differ as to the possibility of fighting the war and solving India's historic problems at the same time. But to make active intervention in the Indian situation a test of liberalism, as some have done, presupposes a definition of liberalism which, I must confess, is beyond my comprehension."

DISCUSSION ON THE FOREGOING PAPER

A MEETING of the Association was held at St. Ermin's, Westminster, S.W. 1, on Thursday, June 3, 1943, when Mr. H. S. L. Polak read a paper entitled " America, Britain and India." The Hon. Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, K.C.S.I., presided.

The CHAIRMAN said that the lecturer was well known on the platform of the Association and had taken part in many of the meetings and discussions. Mr. Polak had had exceptional opportunities of understanding the Indian political situation; he was one of the few still remaining who knew Mr. Gandhi in the old South African days; he had followed Indian politics over a period of three decades, not only Gandhi and Congress politics, but also other schools of political thought in India, especially the Liberal school of thought. Mr. Polak held a watching brief at the Round Table Conference, and no speaker could be better versed in Indian politics or Indian political opinions.

He had not been a casual visitor to the United States; he had spent two years

visiting the North American continent, lecturing, speaking, disputating with individuals, groups and large audiences, and he had had exceptional opportunities of knowing American trends of thought and opinions, and he would now present a picture of the inter-relationship of the three countries.

Mr. POLAK then read his paper.

Mr. GODFREY NICHOLSON, M.P., wrote expressing his regret that Parliamentary business kept him from the meeting. He added: "I feel sure that the meeting will listen to Mr. Polak's paper with the utmost interest. It seems to me to be one of the most important contributions ever made on the subject. Reading between the lines, I am convinced that Mr. Polak has done a great service both to this country and to India by his recent tour. But the main impression left on my mind is the unpleasant one that ignorance about India is almost as great in this country as it is in America. Every word that he says about the lack of comprehension in America applies with equal force here."

"May I venture to suggest that, inspired by Mr. Polak's magnificent work in the United States, the East India Association should give serious thought to what might be done in this country to instruct the great masses of the electorate in the realities of the Indian situation? My own recent experience has been that the public here really do wish to know something about what appears to them to be the complicated tangles of the Indian problem. I do not believe that it would be beyond the capabilities of the able membership of the East India Association to suggest or initiate a modest campaign which might do for Great Britain what Mr. Polak and a few others have done for America."

Captain GAMMANS, M.P., offered his congratulations to Mr. Polak on one of the most thoughtful and comprehensive papers to which he had listened for a long time; they were all indebted to him for the work he had carried out in the United States and Canada.

The Chairman and himself had recently returned from America, where they attended the Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and after that they had a varied experience in Canada and the United States of the reactions towards the Indian question. The first point he would like to make was the extreme importance of American understanding of what was at stake in India today. His own view was that if there was to be any basis of a new world relationship the cornerstone was Anglo-American understanding and friendship. If the British and Americans who had the same basis of law, the same views on democracy and freedom, and spoke the same language could not agree, then what hope was there of agreement with Russia or China or the other nations which were allies today? The greatest point of misunderstanding was on what the Americans loosely called "imperialism," or a new word which they were using, "colonialism," and although for the moment the agitation regarding India had died down, he thought it would recur, and too many steps could not be taken to bring about a full understanding of the facts.

There were some facts about America which must be appreciated: the first was the almost unbelievable and frightening ignorance of the whole subject of the British Commonwealth of Nations. He actually saw in an American paper a comment that after what Canada had done for Great Britain we should cease to tax her—this by a man who signed himself a professor of history! Almost everybody in America believed that India made a contribution to the British Exchequer. It was quite honestly believed that Great Britain received materials from the Empire without paying for them; not one American in thousands had heard of the Statute of Westminster and did not know what it implied.

The second factor was that Americans had a much more emotional appeal to almost every question than the British had, almost a personalized appeal. They saw events in terms of personalities, and events in India were largely personalized around Mr. Gandhi.

The next factor was that there was in the United States a definite section of the population which was anti-British—irrevocably and quite unquestionably anti-British.

How big this section was he could not say; there was the old Irish population, the curious thing being that many of the second or third generation appeared more bitter than their fathers or grandfathers. Then there were the people who had been brought up on a distorted history book. The two wars which America fought before the Civil War were against this country, and the war of 1812 (which nobody in this country knew anything about) was to them a very great struggle.

The trouble with that section of the population was that it did affect politics. The people in Great Britain who were anti-American did not affect our foreign policy; if we wanted to make any arrangement with the United States such feeling as there might be would not have the slightest effect. The anti-British sentiment in America could not be analyzed. He tackled one such individual and said to him that presumably the best news he could hear was that the Germans had over-run Great Britain, the British Empire had disappeared, and so on, and the man replied, "Oh no, I would not agree with that." "Well," said Captain Gammans, "I suppose you agree that every nation in the world needs friends. Who are your best friends, France?" "No, not now." "Germany?" "Good heavens, no." "Russia?" "No," "Well, who do you trust the most?" "Oh, well, you are the only people we really trust." Yet the anti-British sentiments continuously recurred. One never heard a word said about the Dutch Empire or the Portuguese Empire, or the French Empire. At the same time as the anti-British agitation was going on the American administration was guaranteeing the return of Madagascar to France. This section of anti-British feeling must be remembered.

On Sunday morning he was invited to meet a number of very well-meaning Americans who proposed to form themselves into a group to find a solution for the problem of India. They invited him to speak after two hours, having shown the most abysmal ignorance of the situation. He asked if anyone among the gathering knew the meaning of any one of the following expressions: Swaraj, Sikhs, Pakistan. Was he talking about people, Acts of Parliament or mineral water? Nobody knew to what he referred; and he said that if there was a similar gathering in London to tackle the solution of one of the great problems of the United States—the problem of the Negro—which had to admit that they had never heard of Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, or the Mason-Dixon line, they would not consider such a group competent to give advice on the Negro problem. The group agreed and decided to dissolve! That was the background.

What were they to do about it? The point with regard to lectures was admirable, but they should be given by lecturers not from this country but from India. The second point he would like to raise was a question which he put forward in the House of Commons two weeks ago, and that was that representatives of the grand Fourth Indian Division should be brought to this country and sent to America. Nothing would do more to make the American people realize that there was such a thing as the Indian Army than if they could see some of them. Americans simply did not believe that two millions of men had enlisted voluntarily and had covered themselves with glory on every field.

With regard to propaganda generally, he did not know whether the radio or the press was the most potent weapon of propaganda in this country; in the United States it was the film. There was no national press, no national broadcasting in America as there was here, but everybody went to the "movies"; and if there could be some films dealing with India, with Indian political life, Indian social life, the British connection with India, with some of the great statesmen of India dramatized, it would do a tremendous amount of good. Two films shown recently in America had portrayed British life in a way whole boatloads of lecturers could not do.

There were other directions, but the chief point he would like to make was the lack of authoritative statements on the present position in India, and, above all, on British relations with India. Americans always tended to over-simplify a problem, and when they found it was complicated they tended to lose interest in it. So long as they could regard India as a country struggling for freedom which the British would not give they were interested, but when there were complications they lost interest. There should be authoritative statements from three sources; first of all from the British Government, and especially from the Prime Minister himself. He should state

that the Atlantic Charter applied to India and every part of the British Commonwealth, and, in fact, our intentions towards India and every Colony were far more specifically laid down in the Statute of Westminster than in the Atlantic Charter. We had in the Dominions the goal to which every part of the British Empire was now moving and in many cases moving very quickly. That must come from the Prime Minister himself partly because of his prestige and partly because of his previous attitude towards India and the India Act.

The second declaration should come from the Government of India itself. Both the Government of India and the India Office must realize that it was not enough merely to do things; even if they were done honestly the world must be told they were being done in a way it could understand. Why could not someone from the Government of India tell the world that Mr. Gandhi and the Congress Party were in gaol at this moment because they put themselves there, and they could come out tomorrow morning if they would agree to do two things, the first being that they would publicly fore-swear the campaign of sabotage of the Indian war effort, and the second that they would give guarantees to co-operate with the other Indian parties in finding a solution to the deadlock. The Government of India should put the onus on Mr. Gandhi. We had lost the propaganda initiative in India; he thought it would be lost in this country. In other words, sympathy and understanding swung away from the Congress Party after their failure to co-operate with Cripps, now it had swung back, and the Government of India should take steps to clarify the position in words that the ordinary man could understand.

The third authoritative statement should be made by Indian statesmen themselves. He believed that the whole of this problem of India in the finality came down to one very simple thing, and that was sincerity. We should say, "You either believe things when we say them or you don't. When we—that is the British people—and the overwhelming percentage of the House of Commons get up and say that it is our desire and our ambition that India shall enjoy complete and full self-government, the right to walk out of the British Commonwealth if they so wish, do you or don't you believe us. If we are not believed we had better start again, but if you do believe us, then why not say so?" This was the whole crux, not merely of our relations with America, but the whole of the British connection with India.

If the Indian statesmen of all parties would be prepared to issue some statement of that sort in which they were prepared to acknowledge British sincerity it would do much to clarify the position not only here but in the United States and throughout the world.

Speaking personally, he was an unrepentant believer in the British Commonwealth of Nations. He regarded it as the only successful international order which had ever happened. He did not think it needed any apology; it was an international order which for one long year stood in the breach and saved all that remained throughout the world of liberty and decency. The British could not have done it alone; if it had not been for the British Empire the swastika would not only be flying over Buckingham Palace but over every capital city in the world. This was his own personal belief, but he would regard the greatest achievement of the British Empire the attainment by India of complete and full self-government. We should then be able to point to a record to which no nation had ever been able to point—that in 150 years we had gone into India to find anarchy and disunity, but had achieved what she had never before attained, complete unity and complete self-government.

Mr. CHINNA DURAI said that he had a special grouse with regard to people who went about distorting facts either in America or in this country; they might be tempted by a very high sense of bitterness to say things which were not quite true, but if they felt very strongly about India their place was certainly in India. If they renounced their home, their kith and kin, their culture and civilization, and settled down in a far-off country without any idea of returning to their own country, he could not remain silent if they talked politics of a kind which gave a very misleading impression throughout the whole world.

Mr. Polak had referred to his countrymen who had settled down in America and had done some mischief, but his own mind went back to the Indians who had settled

in this country and had made themselves a nuisance in more ways than one. He knew men who had settled here for fifteen years or more who did not want to leave England, having enjoyed the benefit of all that went with liberty and freedom, and he was ashamed of them, and hoped that when they listened to such speeches as those made by Mr. Polak and Captain Gammans their sense of proportion would return, and while they remained in this country they would work for the good of the whole world and not for the party spirit.

Dr. ALICE PENNELL wished to emphasize the ignorance existing in this country. Not very long ago a woman writer was speaking to a meeting on independence for India; she asked her if she had ever been to India, and if she knew anything about it. The reply was no, so Dr. Pennell asked how she dared to speak on the subject, and the lady replied that if she knew nothing about it she could say what she thought! Such people did a very great deal of harm in this country. The disgruntled Indians who came here and were paid to make propaganda against Britain were the same kind of people who were found in America. These people were believed by the Americans because America had a kind of complex about Britain, and if any Indian was ready to talk against Britain he was very well received. She had been in America and knew to her cost how annoyed an audience became if it was told how much Britain had done for India and that there were mutual advantages in the connection.

Another trouble was that the journalists in this country and America, instead of talking about the Indian war effort or the two million volunteers, talked about Gandhi and his 2 ozs. of lime juice daily because they sought to make a sensation. If they could convert the journalists and make them talk of realities and not of hysterics a very great deal would be achieved.

Mr. S. K. RATCLIFFE said that Mr. Polak's specific suggestion for increasing the understanding of Britain and India in the United States, by sending more speakers both British and Indian, was affected by one practical difficulty. He was in the U.S. during the whole time of Mr. Polak's visit, and they had both naturally taken note of the several statements made in London with regard to speakers on the other side of the Atlantic. Since then, he was informed, a strict rule had been laid down that no speakers were allowed to go except in response to definite invitations. Such invitations were actually not few in number, and they could be influenced.

His own experience over a great many years led him to disagree with Captain Gammans as to the character of the addresses on India for which there was a demand. Audiences, he believed, were ready to welcome informed speakers. Most of them did not like an Englishman to abuse his own Government.

He agreed with Captain Gammans as to a change in public sentiment about India since the Cripps Mission. At that time undoubtedly opinion was strongly in favour of the British effort and critical of the Congress leaders, but there had been a slip back from that position. It was to be regretted that the Mission had been followed by a period of official inaction. Sir Stafford doubtless felt when he left India that he could do no more. The appointment of a new Viceroy would provide an opportunity for the greatly needed fresh start.

He wished he could contradict the statements made in the meeting as to the continued public ignorance of India in our own country, but he had lately taken part in a series of discussions under Army Education, and his feeling was that these had left the audiences rather more confused in mind than they were before. He and Mr. Polak had encountered in the U.S. groups of Americans hostile to the British system, but he did not think that either of them could claim a success like that of Captain Gammans in leading them to dissolve.

The CHAIRMAN agreed almost entirely with all Mr. Polak had said in his paper, but he thought Mr. Polak would agree with him when he said that, on the whole, Americans were not anti-British, and any such impression left by the paper would be incorrect. He did not think Mr. Polak intended to say that; he had brought forward the elements and forces which were anti-British and working against a common under-

standing. His own impression, however, was that the Americans were thirsting for information and were not extremely biased.

With regard to Captain Gammans' remarks, it was not only the Indian Government which thought it was not necessary to broadcast the facts. The idea of propaganda was anathema to the Government of India, but it had realized the necessity for a change in their attitude and an information department had been opened. Publicity in this country was very poor; the Government of India had on more than one occasion pointed out to Gandhi that it was open to him to leave prison when he liked if he would dissociate himself from the activities in which he was engaged. Whether a statement to this effect would satisfy American and British opinion was more than the speaker could say.

He would like to make a passing reference to an irrelevant topic which had been introduced. Much had been said about poisonous propaganda carried out by Indians in America. He knew some of the misstatements to which expression was given by Indians both in this country and in America, and he regretted it; he thought a watchful and well-informed public could remove those misrepresentations, but he was bound to say that it was not always the Indian or the Briton who was anti-British who was guilty of misrepresentation or of statements which were exceedingly annoying. There was something to be said for similar propaganda on the other side.

There should be a common-sense attitude brought to bear on the relationship of Great Britain and India both with regard to the past, the present and the future. Even in this country, despite the Indian war effort and the exploits of the Indian Army, there were occasional contributions in the forms of letters to the press and by columnists which were truly exasperating. There was a contribution by a lady called Dorothy Crisp in a Sunday newspaper containing such statements; there should be corrections on both sides; he said this as a candid friend of the British.

With regard to Captain Gammans' contribution, he thought a great deal could be done in that direction, and he would do what he could to make the Government of India a little more conscious of the need for publicity and the need for informing the public of the action they had taken and the reason for such action. He agreed with his other suggestions, both as to the need for authoritative statements and the suggestion made as to constantly sending speakers to America to correct wrong impressions. The main task of defending what had been done in the past, so far as the British connection with India was concerned, must lie in the hands of British speakers. The task of defending the activities of the Government of India at the present time in their relations with various parties must lie in the hands of the Government of India. There would be a great deal of overlapping on either side; one could not refer to what had been done in the past without referring to what was intended in the future and what had been accomplished. There was a great need for propaganda and enlightenment in America. If they were thinking of the future, of laying the solid foundations of world peace, of keeping the friendship and the healthy spirit of understanding which had grown through the stress of war, it was essential that they should not get annoyed because some Americans refused to understand they should do all in their power to create a good understanding among the three peoples with which the lecture had been concerned—the Indian, American and British public.

Mr. POLAR, in reply, said that he shared many of Captain Gammans' experiences, although there were one or two he did not share. Speaking generally, whilst there were a number of audiences who might wish to hear an anti-British point of view, there were an enormous number of audiences who wished to hear the facts set out in a reasonable perspective and a right relationship. Those were the audiences which he had the privilege of addressing, and he very seldom had a hostile reaction; even when they laughed at him it was not ill-naturedly.

With regard to what should be done in the future and the kind of talks which should be given, he was in general agreement with what had been said in the discussion. The two or three Indian Army officers who had been in the United States and who had spoken in different places had had a magnificent reception. They had put India on the map in a way that no one else could have done. They represented India's might and power and idealism in its most practical form; they were able to

show what India had done, what India was doing, what India could do, and what a great power of public opinion in India was helping them to do.

He agreed to the suggestion regarding films; he would say that some quite good films had already been shown in different parts of the country. He had referred to one aspect of this in his paper—that there was a hesitation on the part of the British Information Services, who otherwise did a very fine piece of work, in acting spontaneously in these things; they waited to be asked and the time for that had gone by. People were interested; they wanted to know facts as they were, and if they could be set out pictorially so much the better.

With regard to what could be done by distinguished public men in this country, he felt that if the Prime Minister could do something to overcome the unfortunate misapprehension of what he said with regard to the Atlantic Charter it would do a very great deal of good. He personally never had interpreted those remarks as they were interpreted in America and India, and when he gave his own interpretation to American audiences they appreciated it. The principles contained in the Atlantic Charter were applicable everywhere in the world; they were not intended to apply only to occupied countries in Europe, for when they talked in terms of general principles and spiritual ideals, then doctrines and principles such as those laid down in the Charter must apply universally. To talk of requiring a Pacific Charter seemed to be straining the point, but if the Prime Minister could make a statement in his own clear and lucid terms in regard to India so that he made it clear that whatever he had said in the past he was eagerly looking forward to the future with India as an equal collaborator, it would have a tremendous influence upon American and Indian public opinion. It had been the one thing lacking; but, after all, Mr. Winston Churchill was not lacking in the greater elements of imagination.

He was interested in the remarks of Mr. Durai, Mrs. Pennell and Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe. With regard to what the Chairman had said, he was convinced that most audiences in America were not anti-British; they were exceedingly friendly, they wished to be more friendly and wished to be helped to become friendly, and they wanted to be able to answer some of this "backchat." He agreed as to the necessity of applying the elements of plain common sense in the discussion of these problems. If more unofficial speakers and lecturers could put them in a common-sense way it would be a very great service, leaving it to officials to put the official point of view; in that way they would achieve a collaborative effort which would be really constructive.

Sir ERNEST HOTSON voiced the thanks of the meeting to the Chairman and lecturer. Very seldom, he said, had such a vote been more justified than on this occasion. He hoped this would not be the last occasion on his present visit that they would welcome Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar among them, since there was no one to whom they listened with more pleasure or greater respect. When he went back to India their loss would be India's gain.

Mr. Polak had done a great work in America. Papers such as they had heard today would be of much value if they could reach a wider audience and stimulate interest in the problems of India.

NOTE

SIR FRANK NOYCE writes regarding the report of his speech in the Discussion on the last Indian Census, in the April issue, page 151, that his reference to the unsatisfactory recent progress of literacy in the Province of Madras should read :

"It was all the more disappointing because Madras had such an excellent example set by its neighbours, Travancore and Cochin."

(*End of the Proceedings of the East India Association.*)



THE INDIAN POLITICAL SCENE

By H. G. RAWLINSON, C.I.E.

THE present lull is an opportune moment to take stock of the Indian situation. With the Tunisian victory British stock has risen, and the cloud of pessimism which hung over the scene since the fall of Singapore has lifted. The Japanese attack is held, and it is expected that as the result of Churchill's latest visit to Washington the Allies will now pass to the offensive in the East; the new armies built and trained by the genius of Wavell will set about their task of clearing the Japanese out of Burma and reopening the China road. That, as everyone realizes, is the key to victory.

Meanwhile, India has been passing through another grave crisis in her troubled history, though most of us have been too preoccupied with events nearer home to give the subject the attention it deserves. An excellent survey of the situation has recently appeared from the pen of Professor Coupland, which takes up the story at the time of the passing of the Act of 1935.* It was an inauspicious start. The federal section of the Bill, owing to the non-accession of the States, had not come into operation, and this was destined to have tragic consequences. "If the Princes had not recoiled from the federal scheme," says Professor Coupland, "if the Congress and the League had been willing to play the same part as they did in the Provinces, and it in consequence the federal part of the Act of 1935 had come into force at the same time as the provincial part or not long after, it is not unreasonable to believe that by the autumn of 1939 the new Centre would have been working at least as smoothly as the new Provincial system did in fact work in the non-Congress Provinces, and more smoothly than it worked in the Congress Provinces."

Provincial autonomy had functioned well on the whole—too well, indeed, for the liking of the Congress High Command, which viewed with uneasiness the ready co-operation between its nominees and the Services, and was looking for an opportunity to put an end to a state of affairs which threatened to undermine its authority. The outbreak of war in September 1939 gave them the pretext they sought, and the Congress Ministries, much against their will, were peremptorily ordered to resign. It was now that the consequences of an unreformed Centre began to make themselves felt. Indians on the whole were in favour of supporting the war effort. The dislike of Nazism and Fascism was deep and genuine. But as things were, India had to undergo the humiliation of entering the conflict automatically, while in all the member states of the Commonwealth war was declared on the advice of Ministers responsible to their own Parliaments. Had the Federal Executive Council come into being at once, Professor Coupland thinks, it is more than probable that by this time "advancement by convention," foreseen by the authors of the Act, would have led to the appointment of Indian members of the legislature to the portfolios of Defence and Foreign Affairs, and India would have entered the war, in practice if not in theory, in enjoyment of Dominion status.

After this, matters drifted from bad to worse. The Viceroy left no stone unturned in his efforts to secure a settlement. In October he interviewed Gandhi, Jinnah and Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Congress, and begged them most earnestly to come to terms. He met with a flat rebuff. Congress declined to co-operate unless the 1935 Act was scrapped and the communal question left to a constituent assembly; the Muslim League riposted with a demand for Pakistan—*independent Muslim States in north-west and north-east India*. Then came the *blitzkrieg* of the spring of 1940, and the replacement of Neville Chamberlain and Lord Zetland by Winston Churchill and Mr. Amery.

Though neither of them was exactly *persona grata* with political India, there

* *Report on the Constitutional Problem in India*, Part II, 1936-1943. By R. Coupland, C.I.E., M.A., LITT.D. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d. This is really the second work of a trilogy. Part I dealt with Indian politics, 1833-1935; Part III will discuss the possibilities of a constitutional settlement.

were distinct signs of a rally to the British cause, and Gandhi was forced to retire from the Congress leadership in July. The Viceroy replied with what has been since termed the "August offer," and one cannot escape the feeling that here a great opportunity was missed. The somewhat ambiguous statement that the new constitution was *primarily* the responsibility of Indians themselves was at best a chilling response, and matters were not improved by Amery's insistence in the House of Commons on the want of unity among Indian political leaders. It certainly provided Gandhi with a longed-for opportunity to return to the limelight. He demanded the right to stump the country calling upon the people at large to refrain from supporting the war effort, and when this was refused he threatened to revive Civil Disobedience. Thereupon he, Nehru and other leaders were interned. It is tempting to speculate whether the Cripps Mission would not have stood a better chance if it had arrived in India in August 1940, instead of March 1942. The "August offer" only widened the gulf, and the distrust was deepened by the unfortunate misunderstanding over the Atlantic Charter. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that Congress represented the reactions to the war of India as a whole. The Fourth Indian Division was fighting with its usual splendid gallantry in Africa, recruits were pouring in, and the Eastern Group Conference was meeting at Delhi to mobilize India's industrial resources. The Indian States made notable contributions in men and money.

The next act in the drama was the attack by Japan on Pearl Harbour and the invasion of Malaya. The Viceroy released the interned Congress leaders in an effort to obtain a united front against the common enemy, but they only returned to political life with greatly increased bitterness. British prestige had suffered a severe blow with the fall of Singapore, the defeats inflicted on the Allied fleets at sea and the invasion of Burma. Gandhi, whose Japanese proclivities were evident, in spite of their barbarities (the Mahatma has always enjoyed the faculty of shutting his eyes to inconvenient facts), declared that it was only the presence of England which brought Japan to India at all. If the English went he would make peace with the Japanese. Congress, while not endorsing this attitude, made independence a condition for giving their support. The deadlock eventually became so serious that in January 1942, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru sent a cable to Winston Churchill appealing to him on behalf of the Liberal Party to intervene. There followed the despatch in March of Sir Stafford Cripps with proposals from the Cabinet which appeared to concede all the Congress demands. The future of India was to be a matter for the Indian people themselves, and would be settled after the war by the Congress's own device, a constituent assembly. At the same time, the rights of the Muslims and Princes were safeguarded by a non-accession clause.

The Cripps Mission appeared to be within a measurable degree of success, when Congress suddenly presented a totally fresh demand that the Viceroy's Executive Council should be at once replaced by a Cabinet Government with full powers. This, Sir Stafford stated, was an entirely new proposal, and opened a number of constitutional questions which could not possibly be settled in war-time. Thereupon negotiations broke down and the offer was rejected. As a matter of fact, as an acute observer who was present remarked, the Mission was doomed to failure from the outset. It was based on the belief that Indians could be brought together by persuasion, which was impossible; that they would fight the Japanese, which was doubtful; and that they were strong or united enough to decide their own fate, which was untrue. Had Sir Stafford yielded, the new Cabinet, which would have been predominantly Congress, would have either been persuaded by Gandhi to withdraw from the war altogether or would have been content to offer a merely nominal resistance. The Muslims, who provide the army with many of its best recruits, would have dropped out.* Neither General Wavell nor any other responsible commander would have undertaken the defence of India on these terms.

After the departure of Sir Stafford Cripps, the Viceroy took the somewhat belated step of Indianizing his Council. The choice of members was not altogether happy, and it did not include anyone of the standing of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. Meanwhile, Congress was adopting a more and more menacing attitude, and in the following

* So probably would the Gurkhas, and they are invaluable for jungle warfare.

August Gandhi staged his abortive "rebellion," which, thanks to the prompt action of Government, went off at half-cock. As it was, damage to the extent of £1,000,000 was caused; hundreds of police stations, railway stations and post offices were destroyed, telegraph wires cut and the railway lines torn up. These outrages were practically confined to the United Provinces, Bihar, Bengal and Assam, and northern Madras, and were obviously part of a carefully-thought-out plan to paralyze troop movements. Moreover, the documents seized by the police and reproduced in the Government White Paper, effectually dispose of Gandhi's contention that it was a spontaneous rising prompted by popular anger at his arrest. As a matter of fact, it was not a popular movement at all. It was engineered by Congress and other revolutionary bodies, chiefly with the aid of the *goondas* or hooligans of the Indian underworld. Government officials, down to the humblest village policeman, remained loyal even at the cost of their lives. Of the atrocious murders perpetrated by the mobs, often of unarmed police who had surrendered, the less said the better. There can be little doubt that they were prompted by Gandhi's parting exhortation to "do or die," and his callous sophistry, which disgusted even his own party, that "non-violence" may be interpreted as implying the right of the weaker to use any weapons in his power against a stronger opponent.

And, lastly, what of the future? The first task is, as we have seen, the destruction of the military power of Japan, for until this is done neither India nor any other Asiatic state can enjoy freedom in any shape or form. Nor can the Congress leaders be released until they unconditionally renounce the right to practise civil disobedience while the war continues. After peace is declared it is clear that the major question at issue is not between England and India, but between Indians themselves. The Muslims and the Indian States are stern realities and cannot be disposed of by wishful thinking; all parties must be brought to see that they must make concessions for the common good. As Professor Coupland rightly says, the question at issue is not that of the country's independence, but of the time and method of its attainment. We cannot abdicate unless we have a stable Government to which to hand over. Gandhi would have us abandon the country to "God or anarchy," and complacently looks forward to a time when Indians will "fight like dogs." On the other hand, Mr. Rajgopalachari, the only Congressman who has throughout shown a really statesman-like grasp of the situation, has pointed out that the State is no superstructure, but is bound up so intimately with the functioning of every activity of the people that the withdrawal of the Government without its simultaneous replacement by another would involve the dissolution of society itself. Certainly the Indian question is not going to be the least perplexing of our post-war problems, and its solution cannot be postponed indefinitely.

BARODA IN WAR-TIME: AT HOME AND ABROAD*

By STANLEY RICE

MUCH criticism has been levelled against the Indian States in recent years, chiefly by the members of the Congress Party. They are called autocracies, anachronisms, obstacles in the way of Indian progress and unity, and many other unpleasant things. Some, no doubt, of the abuse is well merited by those States which are still mediæval in their outlook, but certainly not by progressive States such as Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore and Baroda. The late Maharaja of Baroda was, and was acknowledged to be, one of the most enlightened Princes in India. Often he seemed to be pursuing visionary schemes and to be leaving on one side the more immediate problems, but he was in truth building wisely for the future and was content to leave

* Speeches by Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, Dewan, Baroda State. Baroda: Information Offices.

the solution of immediate questions to his Councillors. His great concern was always for the poorer and even the poorest of his subjects, and you might see his car surrounded by outcastes who clamoured to present their individual petitions—a thing unthinkable in less liberal days when the approach of an "Untouchable" would be instantly rebuffed by his aide-de-camp.

The mantle of Elijah seems to have fallen on Elisha. The young Maharaja on his accession immediately announced the grant of a princely sum from his private purse to be devoted to what is called—in somewhat worn phrase—"the uplift of the people." He also promulgated a new Constitution which may not have altogether pleased the radicals, but was a great step forward towards democratic government. He declared that he desired a policy of association of the people of the State with the Administration, and said that the new Constitution was based on the complete identity of interest between the Ruler and the ruled and among all sections of the population.

In this Proclamation, which every upholder of democracy must recognize as being as little autocratic as can be and which indeed he could himself hardly improve upon, we may be sure that the Dewan, Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, had a hand, for the late Maharaja, and no doubt his successor, took no step without consulting this able adviser, who has held the office half as long again as any of his predecessors. He has always been an admirer of democracy, though not necessarily of the form it has taken in Britain. Incidentally, it may be remarked that while many Indian supporters of democracy have said much the same thing, no other form has even been suggested in concrete form. The Indian idea of democracy is, perhaps, naturally based on Britain, which is, of course, the democratic country which educated Indians know best. No one has suggested, so far as I am aware, that India should shape its Constitution on that of the United States, which its own citizens regard as the best in the world. The conflict in India has raged round elected representatives, or responsibility of Ministers to the Legislative Assembly—that is, to Parliament. The principle of the irremovable executive, which is one of the chief points on which American democracy differs from British, the idea that it is open to the President to give ministerial posts to men whose political party label does not correspond to his own, which may well have suggested the idea of a National Government—all this and much more might well be studied by Indian Nationalist leaders more carefully than they have hitherto done. The Diwan of Baroda has long been a student of constitutional questions, and though he comes down whole-heartedly on the side of democracy he does not think that the path will be too easy. "Democracy," he says, "is a most difficult form of government; it has to justify itself by its achievements for the good of the people, and it must be sustained and kept alive by the spirit of give and take, mutual understanding and compromise becoming widespread among us." He reminds his hearers of the many obstacles that lie ahead in India before this ideal can be attained: "There should be harmonious development on all sides. We cannot have a modern Constitution with social ideas which go back to the Middle Ages." There is much in the social sphere that must be cut away. For if the principle, laid down by the Maharaja, of the identity of interest between Ruler and people, *among all sections of the population*, is to be maintained, it is obvious that there must be considerable reform in such matters of "Untouchability," which denies to one large section the most elementary rights of man, and early marriage, which bears hardly upon woman.

It is natural that most of the "speeches" with which we are now concerned should be about the internal affairs of the State; Baroda is at present only in the back-wash of the war.. But His Highness is not only wholly devoted to the Allied cause, but has given practical proof of his attitude by generous gifts. He has subscribed very largely in money, which has enabled Baroda to put into the war effort a squadron of Spitfires and a vessel, *Baroda*, which is doing duty with the Royal Indian Navy. He has also sent his second infantry regiment, composed chiefly of Marathas, to the front, and has thus given encouragement to other States to follow his example. If the subscriptions to the Allied cause appear small to a country which has grown accustomed to thinking in millions sterling, let it be remembered that India is a poor country and that Baroda, though high in prestige among the States, is only the size of Wales. But it is not only in respect of money that the State has taken action. Vigorous steps have been taken to introduce A.R.P. measures, and it is gratifying to learn

that the response to the appeal for voluntary help has been good. At present the position in Western India does not call for any anxiety, but things may change for the worse, and it is well to be forearmed and not to live in a fool's paradise. Moreover, the condition of India's food supply is not such as to create optimism, and in organizing a "grow-more-food" drive the Government of Baroda is doing what it can to help not only itself but all India. It is an expression, so far as it goes, of the Diwan's own conviction that unity must before all be achieved if India is to rise to the heights for which she is fitted. It is calculated that some 130,000 acres, which now grow inferior cotton and such commercial crops, may be turned over to rice, wheat and other food grains. This would be no mean achievement, seeing that Baroda is essentially a cotton-growing State and that the conservatism of the ryot is notoriously difficult to overcome.

A further direction in which the war effort is conducted is the organization of a body called the National War Front, which is designed "to sustain public morale, to root out defeatism and stop alarmist rumours and their spread by circulating correct facts about the war widely among the people," to prevent panic, so that all situations that may arise may be met with courage. His own contribution to this desirable end is a declaration of his firm faith in the ultimate victory of the Allies. "There may be ups and downs, but there can be no doubt that the Allies will be victorious." Or again, "There can be no doubt about our ultimate victory. The resources of the democratic Powers are so great that the Axis Powers can never defeat them . . . There can be no doubt that the ultimate victory will be with the United Nations." It is difficult to see what more a State like Baroda can do either to help itself or the national war effort, especially if we throw in exhortations to subscribe more freely to the war loans and to avoid using the railways unnecessarily. There is, of course, as yet no need to ration food or to introduce the black-out, and Baroda is at present spared the inconvenience of these measures.

The political ferment in India has left Baroda, if not untouched, since it has not been without its influence in stimulating the approach to democracy, yet only indirectly influenced. While there was a Congress Government in Bombay the Government of Baroda and the Maharaja co-operated with it, in accordance with their own principle that everything should work towards unity and that nothing good could come of discord. "The question that faces us is how to continue the movement for fusion. . . . This can be brought about by realization of the fact that all of us, Hindus and Muslims, have common patriotism, that we are citizens of India first and last. The task that faces us is the evolution of a common patriotism and a sense of common citizenship. This cannot be achieved unless we study and understand with sympathy each other's cultures and the common triumph in the field of literature and art. Thus only can we realize the underlying unity of our common civilization." These are brave words, not perhaps very original, but no one has yet found the means of putting them into practice. Throughout the speeches, if they can be called speeches, for the majority are merely *ad hoc* remarks addressed to the Dhara Sabha (the Baroda Parliament) or on special occasions such as the unveiling of a statue or a picture, there runs this insistence on the need for unity and on "the synthesis of races, religions and cultures." It may be that this question of cultural relations may prove to be the key which will eventually open the fast-closed door of the room where the solution of Hindu-Muslim relations is to be found. At present, it is to be feared, it is no more than a dream, and no Daniel has arisen to give us the interpretation thereof. In a recent book Mr. Herbert Agar, an American writer, has sought to show that unless we give their true value to things of the spirit the civilization of Europe, and with it the civilization of Asia, is doomed to perish, and those who put their faith only in material things—wealth, power, trade and so forth—will bring upon the world a greater catastrophe than any we have yet known. Not that there should be a movement towards uniformity; diversity in unity should be the goal. As the late Maharaja has said: "There should be no striving after a soul-destroying uniformity . . . we all want to develop naturally, each according to the path of evolution." It is with this idea of unity in mind that Sir V. T. Krishnamachari gives his whole-hearted support to the Cripps Mission. He calls the proposals "the greatest landmark in the history of the British connection with India," and it is clear that he sincerely deplores

the breakdown of the negotiations. The Diwan, like the late Maharaja, is a convinced Nationalist at heart, though he does not approve of the methods of anarchy which masquerade under the less disturbing title of non-violent non-co-operation. As he once said to me : "We shall not do it [govern the country] so well, but we want to do it ourselves." He is an admirer of British administration, on which he has modelled his own administration of the State, and many of his best friends are Englishmen.

But, after all, his first concern is, and must be, Baroda State, and to him the most important question is rural reconstruction : to raise the masses from the poverty and often the squalor in which they live, though, for a variety of reasons, the squalor is seldom as bad as that in our own slums; to lead them into a sense of a better and more useful life. He points out more than once that in the long interval between sowing and reaping, when there is no work to be done in the fields, the men are idle and that this idleness frequently leads to quarrels, to village faction and strife, to economic inefficiency and to litigation. It is, in fact, a case of Satan finding mischief for the idle; an attempt has been made to introduce cottage industries, without much success, owing to the intense conservatism of the ryot. So long as he has enough to eat and enough clothes to wear he does not care. The acquisition of wealth does not ordinarily attract him. Various efforts have been made to improve his standard of living. He has been approached from the angle of health and cleanliness, to which the customs of throwing refuse into the street and of keeping manure heaps at the back door are a considerable menace, but without apparent effect. The villager easily slides back into the old ways. I have known a whole village to be decimated by cholera because a funeral party washed their clothes in the drinking reservoir.

The Diwan pins his faith to the co-operative system. This idea, borrowed largely from Italy and Germany, was first introduced upon a report by Sir F. Nicholson about the year 1900. Considering the length of time it has been in existence it cannot be said to have had the effect that was hoped for in combating the resort to the moneylender. It was argued *a priori* that low interest would attract the ryot, but he, as usual, suspected that this was just another devilish device for raising taxation. He was, moreover, obliged to repay instalments punctually, a rule that he frequently ignores, preferring the time-honoured moneylender, who was always willing to extend credit to the solvent without asking inconvenient questions. Possibly, too, he may resent inquisition into his affairs, without which loans cannot be freely granted. It must also be acknowledged that at the beginning of the movement the object in view was not explained with sufficient care to the ryot, who thought that the whole plan was simply an agency to supply him with money at cheap rates. Baroda, in spite of the Diwan's enthusiasm, was faring none too well. It was easy, as it was everywhere, to organize societies, but many of them were of mushroom growth and soon faded out. The public imagination has not been stirred or its confidence captured. There was, moreover, a strong disinclination to spend money on an efficient staff, and this threw on the Registrar far too much work, while for the rest there was nothing but some clerks who had not, and could not, be expected to have the prestige which would command the confidence of the villagers. In vain I pleaded for an intermediate staff; in vain I pointed out that the whole expenditure, outside some petty items, must be on staff; my colleagues were adamant and were not to be persuaded. Since that time improvements have been announced and the quality of the societies themselves has risen, but the Government has still a hard row to hoe. The Diwan, who makes a special study of economics, declares his conviction that "there is no salvation for agriculturists in India except through the co-operative movement . . . which of all the activities which conduce to the welfare of the people is dearest to the hearts of His Highness the Maharaja and myself." But no one knows better that Rome was not built in a day and that it will take many weary years of effort before any appreciable result can be obtained.

Another approach to the "better life" is by the medical path. This has not been systematically explored as yet, though some isolated action has been taken. The State has been largely given pure drinking water; anti-malarial measures were inaugurated and have come to stay; a campaign has been undertaken against guinea worm; and of late (1940) a tuberculosis sanatorium has been started. Nothing can be more

precious to the ryot than his health, and though the instances quoted are valuable efforts to improve the health of the people, there seems to be no co-ordinated effort, no attempt to incorporate it into a scheme of rural reconstruction. It is generally admitted that the provision for health is inadequate; there are many—one might say hundreds—of villages out of easy reach of medical relief. The means of subsistence are cared for, but not to the same degree the subsistence itself.

The other most important branch of this work is education, and in no department has the Diwan been more interested than in the educational. This is a legacy of the late Maharaja, who was the first in India to make education compulsory and who always showed keenly he was alive to the need for increasing literacy. In a State which is so predominantly agricultural one cannot expect the ideal, and it is no wonder that many who are slightly educated should relapse into illiteracy. The ryot can rarely make use of his knowledge; he is too absorbed in the mere effort to live at all, and if there is no desire to read it is not the fault of the Government. The people have been given libraries (both fixed and circulating), and facilities for reading have thus been placed within reach of 80 per cent. of the population. Steps have, it seems, been taken to correct the "lapse into illiteracy," but in the conditions of the State it is hardly likely that more than about 50 per cent. of the people will be converted for many years to come.

All this may seem very far from the war, but, after all, Baroda is a long way from any enemy and the business of the State must go on. These speeches or addresses date from 1927 and naturally the greater part of them deal with State affairs. The Maharaja and the Diwan are both firm adherents of the British connection. The State has been formed on the British model, and though sometimes it would seem that it has attempted too much and that it would have been better to concentrate upon less, yet the boldness of the conception may well excite admiration. The Diwan has had to deal with four great events—the great floods of 1927, the unrest of 1930, the death of the late Maharaja, and the war. With the first two he dealt successfully, and now that the problem of the war has fallen to his lot he is taking whatever precautions seem advisable to meet possible contingencies. He would not call himself an orator, but what he says is marked by sincerity and he usually talks blunt common sense.

UNTOUCHABLE INDIA

By R. R. Bhole, M.L.A.

Of all the minority problems in the world, none is more tragic than that of the Untouchables—also referred to as the "Depressed Classes" or "Scheduled Castes." The status, or rather lack of status, of the Untouchables has only in comparatively recent times come into the forefront of the political scene, and yet the Depressed Classes form the third largest group in India; according to the 1941 Census they numbered about 50 millions. How untouchability first started is obscure, but it must have taken concrete form in very ancient times.

It is difficult for anyone who has not been in India to realize the magnitude of the problem. The terrible plight of 50 million human beings outside the pale, treated by many as if they were of less account than dogs, continually weighs upon the consciousness of social reformers in India.

According to the Census of 1931 the "exterior castes" aggregated nearly 50 millions, four-fifths of whom were to be found in British India. Mr. L. S. S. O'Malley, in *India's Social Heritage*, points out that the Census Commissioner, in arriving at the figure of 50 millions, took the five following disabilities into consideration : (1) Obstacles in the way of using public institutions or amenities, such as schools, wells or bathing-places; (2) prohibition on entry into Hindu temples or, in some cases, on the use of burning ghats—that is, places of cremation; (3) refusing to

render them service on caste grounds—e.g., by barbers, tailors or washermen; (4) refusal to take water from them; and (5) pollution by contact or proximity.

One of the first occasions in recent times when the problem of the amelioration of the Depressed Classes was considered by a Legislative Council was on March 16, 1916, when Mr. Dadabhoj* proposed the following resolution in the Council Chamber at Delhi :

“ That this Council recommends to the Governor-General in Council that measures be devised, with the help, if necessary, of a small representative Committee of officials and non-officials, for an amelioration in the moral, material and educational condition of what are known as the Depressed Classes, and that, as a preliminary step, the local Governments and administrations be invited to formulate schemes with due regard to local conditions.”

The resolution was finally withdrawn by its proposer in the hope that the Government would take steps in the near future to provide special facilities for the advancement of the Depressed Classes. In view of the historic nature of the occasion some extracts from Mr. Dadabhoj's speech are given :

“ If India is to make a sound progress as a whole, the moral and material condition of the people in the lowest rungs cannot surely be neglected, or even regarded with benevolent indifference. But somehow the problem has not so far been tackled with that earnestness of purpose and determination which a conviction of its gravity and its supreme importance to the welfare of the body politic could ensure. After long years the educated Indian is slowly waking up to the grim realities of the situation, but the amount of prejudice is still great. . . . The case of Hindu Untouchables presents an entirely new set of difficulties. That any man, made after the image of God, endowed with brains and a moral sense, should pollute his fellow-beings with his touch is incredible. The very idea is revolting and is enough to shock humanity. But despite our vaunted civilization, despite our progress and enlightenment, large bodies—nay, millions—of men have been relegated to that infamous position for centuries through Brahmanical persecution . . . the exclusion of the Depressed Classes from even court-houses and other public places, in certain parts of India, is a notorious fact. The pariah, under the penalty of severe punishment, must call out from a long distance on the public way to warn high-caste Hindus of his presence. The touch of the filthiest vermin does not offend so much as that of the untouchable man. Could human perversity go further? Could hatred brutalize humanity more? And yet that is a true picture of even the present state of things. It is a shame to Hindu society, it is a shame to Hindu culture, it is a shame to India. Government really cannot sit idle in the face of such enormity.”

The question is how does the matter stand now? For that one may proceed to consider what a Committee appointed in 1928 as a result of the resolution passed by the Bombay Legislative Council to enquire into the grievances of the Depressed Classes and of aboriginal tribes had to say. Dr. Ambedkar was appointed a member of the Committee; the majority of the members were Hindus. The Committee was presided over by an officer of the I.C.S., Mr. Starte, who was in charge of the criminal tribes. In paragraph 102 of this Report it is stated :

“ Although we have recommended various remedies to secure to the Depressed Classes their rights to all public utilities, we fear that there will be difficulties in the way of their exercising them for a long time to come. The first difficulty is the fear of open violence against them by the orthodox classes. It must be noted that the Depressed Classes form a small minority in every village, opposed to which is a great majority of the orthodox, who are bent on protecting their interests and dignity from any supposed invasion by the Depressed Classes at any cost. The danger of prosecution by the police has put

* Now Sir Maneckji Dadabhoj (President of Council of State).

a limitation upon the use of violence by the orthodox classes, and consequently such cases are rare.

"The second difficulty arises from the economic position in which the Depressed Classes are found today. The Depressed Classes have no economic independence in most parts of the Presidency. Some cultivate the lands of the orthodox classes as their tenants at will. Others live on their earnings as farm labourers employed by the orthodox classes, and the rest subsist on the food or grain given to them by the orthodox classes in lieu of service rendered to them as village servants. We have heard of numerous instances where the orthodox classes have used their economic power as a weapon against those Depressed Classes in their villages when the latter have dared to exercise their right, and have evicted them from their land and stopped their employment and discontinued their remuneration as village servants. This boycott is often planned on such an extensive scale as to include the prevention of the Depressed Classes from using the commonly used paths and the stoppage of sale of the necessities of life by the village bania. According to the evidence, sometimes small causes suffice for the proclamation of a social boycott against the Depressed Classes. Frequently it follows on the exercise by the Depressed Classes of their right to the use of the common well, but cases have been by no means rare where a stringent boycott has been proclaimed simply because a Depressed Classes man has put on the sacred thread, has bought a piece of land, has put on good clothes or ornaments, or has carried a marriage procession with the bridegroom on the horse through the public street."

The status of the Depressed Classes occupied the attention of the Legislative Assembly at Bombay on October 26, 1939. During the debates on India's participation in the war, Dr. Ambedkar spoke of the position of the Depressed Classes, and referred to the unaltered fact that in a unified India the Hindus would always form a majority and that the Muslims and the Scheduled Castes would always remain in a minority. He pointed out that outside every Hindu village, scattered throughout the land, there would be "a small appendix, if I may use that expression, a few clusters of huts, a few mud houses of people who are called 'Untouchables.'"

Dr. Ambedkar, in his speech on this occasion, quoted cases when Untouchable communities, who had suffered at the hands of their Hindu neighbours, had sought redress in the local courts of law, only to find justice denied to them owing to the fact that the great majority of the dispensers of justice throughout India were orthodox Hindus.

The proceedings of the All-India Depressed Classes Conference held in Nagpur, July 17 to 20, 1942, prove that the Untouchable Community today is fully alive to the necessity of political action. The All-India Depressed Classes Conference was noteworthy for three reasons: 75,000 people were present at its sessions, of whom not less than one-quarter consisted of women; it was noteworthy because of the resolutions passed by the Conference; and, above all, because of its decision to establish an All-India organization to be called the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation. The leaders of the Untouchables expressed their determination to win for their followers, the third largest group in India, their rightful position by the creation of a strong political organization.

The resolutions passed at the Nagpur Conference in July were referred to in the Press as constituting "the Pakistan of the Depressed Classes." Henceforth the hope was expressed that the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation would act as the single mouthpiece of the Depressed Classes throughout the country, and that all the small and provincial organizations would merge their identity in this central organization, offshoots of which were in process of formation in every province. The Nagpur Conference marked an important milestone in the long and weary journey of the Untouchables to a better and brighter future.

One of the chief difficulties which confronts the leaders of the Depressed Classes is how to remove the "inferiority complex" from their followers, many of whom have known no other existence than that of serfs. As the result of political agitation the grievances and demands of Muslim India, the second largest community in the

country, are constantly in the public eye. The All-India Scheduled Castes Federation is determined that its supporters, who number nearly two-thirds that of the Muslim population, shall be equally energetic in its methods, and insists that the curse of Untouchability must and can be removed from India. The leaders of the Depressed Classes hope that their cause will receive in the future greater attention in the columns of the Press.

In his speech at Nagpur, Dr. Ambedkar explained how the idea of holding a Conference of the Depressed Classes originated. He referred to his visit to Delhi in April, 1942, to meet Sir Stafford Cripps, who brought with him the proposals of His Majesty's Government in Great Britain for constitutional changes in India. Before going to see Sir Stafford, Dr. Ambedkar met representatives of the Depressed Classes, and, as a result of these deliberations, leaders of the Scheduled Castes throughout India decided that the proposals brought by Sir Stafford Cripps, if adopted, would deal a death-blow to their interests. Great resentment was felt by the leaders of the Untouchables at the apparent ignoring of their position. Dr. Ambedkar and his colleagues decided that if "Untouchable India" was to be saved from impending political doom united action on the part of the Scheduled Castes from all parts of India was a matter of great urgency. The Nagpur Conference was the result, and it was representative of *Untouchable India as a whole*. Dr. Ambedkar was asked to preside over the Conference, but owing to his subsequent appointment as Labour Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, the presidency of the Conference was assumed by Rao Bahadur B. Shiva Raj, M.L.A., who has long worked for the cause of the Depressed Classes and represents them in the Central Legislature.

The great strides made by the Untouchables during the past twenty years and their rapidly growing political consciousness were frequently referred to at the Nagpur Conference. The community was by degrees, it was stated, securing a firm foothold in the public institutions and services of the country. The present generation of the Depressed Classes must sometimes have difficulty in realizing the great progress that has been made by their cause during the past two decades. Twenty years ago, when Dr. Ambedkar returned from England as a barrister, at a meeting in Bombay, he relates that, apart from the organizers of the meeting, "the audience was non-existent, although some persons were sitting on the doorsteps of nearby houses, smoking their pipes and talking"—the public were not sufficiently interested to enter the lecture-hall.

At the Nagpur Conference, Dr. Ambedkar pointed with justifiable pride to the gathering of 75,000 people. Great progress has been made in education. In Poona, 50 youths from the Depressed Classes are studying in college. Today there are some 500 Untouchables who have graduated from the Universities, a small enough total, but a beginning. These young men have become doctors, barristers and members of municipal, district and local boards. Not many years ago Untouchables were not permitted to be members of these boards for fear of causing pollution, but by slow degrees other communities are becoming conscious of the need for the display of greater practical sympathy.

It is to expedite this process that the leaders of the Untouchables are focusing the political action of their followers. They are specially anxious for them to fill a higher percentage of positions in the army and the police. Till recently the police department was closed to them. These disabilities, under which the community has been suffering, have now been removed in some of the provinces.

In the present war there are already three battalions of Untouchables. The links of the Indian Army with the Depressed Classes are long-standing. In the days of the East India Company the majority of the Indian forces were Untouchables. It was only in 1892 that Mahars* were precluded from joining the army. In the present war a certain number of King's Commissions are being given to Untouchable youths with suitable qualifications. Dr. Ambedkar proudly points to the fact that the British forces which finally overcame the Maharattas in the Napoleonic Wars were largely composed of Untouchables and that in the Indian Mutiny these regiments remained steadfast in their allegiance to the British Crown.

* The caste to which Dr. Ambedkar belongs.

A writer to the *Times of India* in an article entitled "The Last of a Great Army," October 20, 1932, described how the Depressed Classes and Indian Christians, from which they were largely drawn, "with rum and beef in their bellies, Brown Bess on their shoulders, carried the Union Jack from the Great Wall of China to Africa and the French Islands."^{*} The cessation of recruiting from the Untouchables half a century ago was a severe blow; it denied to them an honourable career, for in the British Army they could hold commissioned rank. On retirement many of them were appointed Honorary Magistrates, and thereby helped to raise the prestige of their community. Dr. Ambedkar's father, grandfather and great-grandfather held commissions in the British Army.

One of the most hopeful features of the present position of the Untouchables is the progress being made by their womenfolk. The fact that 20,000 women were present at the Nagpur Conference is a potent fact which cannot be ignored. While proud of the progress recently made by their community, its leaders emphasize the fact that it is not the result of Hindu charity. "The gods help those who help themselves" is their motto. To use Dr. Ambedkar's words: "Progress in the competition of communities is the result of power. This power may be economic, it may be social or it may be political. Have we power to sustain our progress? Have we economic power? We have none. We are a class of serfs. Have we social power? We have none. We are a degraded portion of humanity. The only thing, therefore, we can depend upon for our continued progress is the capture of political power. I have no doubt that is our salvation; without it we will perish. It is on this question we must concentrate all our attention. It is a question of life and death for us."

The keynote of the policy of the leaders of the community rests on the assumption that the Untouchables are not a sub-section of the Hindus, but that they are a *separate and distinct element in the national life of India*; as separate and distinct as the Muslims, and, like the Muslims of India, they are entitled to separate political rights.

In striking the balance of the forces working for and against the claims of the Depressed Classes for separate political rights, Dr. Ambedkar sums up the pros and cons: "At the Round-Table Conference a contest took place between Mr. Gandhi and me. He asserted that the Untouchables were a sub-section of the Hindus, and consequently that if political power were to pass from the hands of the British it should be given to the Hindus, who could be trusted to look after the interests of the Untouchables." In London Dr. Ambedkar refuted this doctrine. He contended that the Untouchables form a separate and distinct element in the life of India. He asserted that the Hindus, the hereditary enemies of the Depressed Classes, could not be trusted, and, judging by past experience, far from raising the status of the Untouchables, in all likelihood they would perpetuate their subjection. At the Round-Table Conference Dr. Ambedkar dwelt on the supreme necessity of the Untouchables obtaining political power, which they could use to promote their own welfare and thus save themselves from the tyranny and oppression of the Hindus, and in 1932 in London their claim was recognized as a result of the Communal Award. "Its great importance," says Dr. Ambedkar, "lies in the fact that the Untouchables were thereby recognized in the national life of India and entitled to claim separate political rights."

Mr. Gandhi at first did not accept the Communal Award, but started a "fast unto death" intended to compel the British Government to alter the decision of the Round-Table Conference. But he failed in his fast, and the subsequent Poona Pact, arranged in 1932, recognized the claim of the Depressed Classes to be treated as a distinct element, separate from the Hindus, and entitled to separate political recognition. In the Viceroy's Declaration of August 8, 1940, the claim of the Untouchables to be treated as a distinct and separate element in the national life of India, as distinct as the Muslims, was reaffirmed.

In his speech at the Nagpur Conference, Dr. Ambedkar claimed that by signing the Poona Pact he hoped to save the life of Mr. Gandhi, and he added: "Mr. Gandhi accepted the Poona Pact, not as a gentleman signing an agreement with the intention

* Though it should be added that for the most part they were under British officers.

of honouring his word, but as a crafty person seeking to find a way out of a difficulty. Mr. Gandhi never gave his true and honest consent to the principle underlying this Pact, but remained a determined opponent to the claim of the Untouchables for separate political recognition, and has ever since done everything possible to oppose our claim and undermine our position. I want you to bear in mind that Mr. Gandhi is our greatest opponent. I do not like to use the word 'enemy,' though there has been enough justification for it. There are some among us who are deluded by the artificiality of phraseology, but I must warn you that you will be making the greatest mistake if you forget to take note of the fact that among the adverse forces which are weakening your side, against which you have to concentrate in your battle for political freedom, the most formidable is Mr. Gandhi."

Another adverse circumstance in the position of the Untouchables referred to at Nagpur was the changed relationship existing between the Muslims and the Depressed Classes. Formerly there was a solidarity, based on community of interests, among the different Minority Committees in India, among whom, of course, the Muslim Community was the most powerful. The change in the relationship between the two communities has been primarily brought about, according to Dr. Ambedkar, by the change in outlook of the Muslim Community, as a result of the activities of the Muslim League. When the Muslim League was resuscitated by Mr. Jinnah, after the 1937 elections, the doctrine was proclaimed by the Muslims that as a minority they needed the strength of other minorities to support and sustain them. The Muslim League had hitherto espoused the cause of other minorities, and it passed resolutions pledging their support and had stood out as champion of all the other minorities in India. In recent years a change has taken place in the policy of the Muslim League.

Since the passing of the resolution on Pakistan, the doctrine that the Muslims are a nation and not a community has been adopted. The Muslim League today proclaims that it has nothing to do either with the Hindu community or the other minority communities, claims Dr. Ambedkar. It is a line-up of Muslims *versus* non-Muslims. What this change implies is thus summed up by Dr. Ambedkar: "This change in the attitude of the Muslim League cannot but have serious consequences for the Untouchables. It means that they have lost an ally. . . . It has set up a new equation of values. It means that the Muslims, whatever their numbers, are just equal to the non-Muslims, and therefore in any political arrangements the Muslims must get 50 per cent." Dr. Ambedkar says that this is a proposal to which no one representing the Depressed Classes can consent.

The leaders of the Untouchables, as part of their programme, demand that in the new Constitution provision for the granting of a sum of money to be set apart annually in the Budget of every Province and in the Centre for the education, both primary and higher, of the Untouchables be made. Higher education is of a special importance at this stage in their march towards better things, in order that suitable candidates capable of filling high administrative posts may be provided. Their programme includes a demand for a definite number of posts in the public service, subject, of course, to the applicant possessing the requisite minimum qualifications. Dr. Ambedkar remarks: "Administration is bad because it is in the hands of caste Hindus, who carry their old prejudices into the administration and persistently deny to the Untouchables, for one reason or another, the principle of equal benefit to which they are entitled. Good laws do you no good unless you have good administration, and you can only have good administration when you have persons belonging to the Untouchable Community holding high administrative posts from which they can watch how the Hindu Civil Servants are behaving towards the Depressed Classes."

Insistence upon securing adequate representation for the Untouchables in the Central and Provincial Executives was therefore part of a programme agreed to at Nagpur. The leaders of the Untouchables are essentially practical in their demands. They attach great importance to the project of new settlements for the Untouchables being established completely separate and independent from the Hindu villages. Dr. Ambedkar thus defined the position of his community: "Why have the Untouchables been the slaves and serfs of the Hindus for so many thousand years? To my mind the answer lies in the peculiar organization of Hindu villages. You have, spread out all over India, some 700,000 Hindu villages; attached to every Hindu

village there exists a settlement of Untouchables. This settlement is numerically very small as compared to the Hindu village to which it is attached. This settlement of Untouchables is economically without any resources and without any opportunity for improvement. It is invariably a landless population. Being Untouchables, it could not sell anything because no one would buy from an Untouchable. It is wholly a population of landless labour and dependent for its livelihood upon the Hindu village. It lives by begging food or by offering its labour for a paltry wage.

"In this setting you can well understand why the Untouchable has remained in a degraded condition for so many centuries. As against the Hindu village, the Untouchable settlement simply could not offer any resistance. It is numerically small and economically poor. As long as this village system continues to exist in its present form the Untouchables will never achieve their independence, whether social or economic, and they will never get over their inferiority complex which they have developed as a result of their condition of social and economic dependence.

"The village system must therefore be changed in so far as it applies to the Untouchable Communities. They must be emancipated from the stranglehold which the Hindus have acquired over them down the ages. My suggestion, therefore, is that you should insist upon a provision being made in the Constitution for the formation of new independent villages, composed exclusively of Untouchables, to be erected at the public cost and to be sponsored by the Central Government. There is much unoccupied land capable of cultivation belonging to the Government; this should be reserved for the purpose of giving effect to the scheme of providing new villages for the Untouchables. The Government could also buy vacant land from private individuals to be used for the same purpose.

"There does not appear to be any insuperable difficulty in an effort to induce Untouchables to move from their present habitations to the proposed new settlements, where, with adequate financial aid, they could be established as independent farmers. To carry out such a great experiment would of course require much time."

The attitude of the Depressed Classes towards the war was referred to at the Nagpur Conference. Dr. Ambedkar remarked: "From the beginning we have supported the war effort; we shall continue to lend it our support. We have our political demands which we insist shall be satisfied . . . we do not lay down any conditions for our support of the war, because we feel that the successful issue of the war will help us better in the realization of our demands. This is a war between democracy and dictatorship—not an enlightened dictatorship, but a dictatorship of the most barbarous character, based not on an imperial ideal, but on racial arrogance."

Addressing the members of the Women's Conference of the Depressed Classes, Dr. Ambedkar referred to the great numbers of women present, "It would have been unthinkable ten years ago." He thus concluded his remarks: "Learn to be clean, keep free from all vices, give education to your children, instil ambition in them, inculcate in their minds the thought that their community can become great. Remove from them all inferiority complex. Don't be in a hurry to marry; you should not impose marriage upon your children unless they are able to meet all liabilities. Those who marry should bear in mind that it is a crime to have too many children. The parental duty lies in giving each child a better start than its parents had. Let each girl who marries stand up to her husband. She should claim to be her husband's friend and equal and refuse to be his slave."

There are some things that cannot be permitted to endure, and Untouchability is one of them. The third largest community in India has, since the dim ages, been denied everything which tends to make life worth living. The Depressed Classes include within their ranks "Unseenables," who may only move about at night, "Unapproachables," who can only come within a certain distance of the caste Hindu, and a section whose shadows even can pollute the passer-by. Dr. Ambedkar relates his own experience when he returned to his native village to attend his brother's wedding after an absence of some years. During his sojourn in Bombay sympathy with the Untouchable cause had begun to bring about an improvement in their treatment, but Indian villages are conservative, how conservative he did not realize till he returned and was rebuked by a high-caste Hindu because he had allowed his shadow to fall upon him!

The most menial tasks in India are reserved for the Untouchables; they are the sweepers, scavengers and removers of night-soil. The visiting European who spends most of his time in hotels does not come into direct contact with Untouchables unless he happens to come across his sweeper in his bathroom or lavatory; on his appearance the mehtar at once withdraws, as if apologizing for his mere existence, in "a spirit of humility and of shrinking subordination." Perhaps the greatest tragedy of Untouchability is the sense of inferiority it engenders in the members of the community. They are regarded as lower than dogs; inexorable laws have defined their position in the scheme of things. By the caste system their destiny is decided; the remover of night-soil for his working life knows no other task. Hindu religion explains his position by stating that he is expiating the sins of former lives—a comfortable doctrine for those outside the ranks of Untouchability. The doctrine of "Karma" is briefly the belief that "a man reaps as he sows, that he benefits by good deeds. . . . In this life he pays the penalty or receives the reward for his acts in a former existence . . . a man's caste is, therefore, determined by his past" (*India's Social Heritage*).

Recent legislation, varying in different Provinces, permits the Depressed Classes to visit the temples and to draw water from the village wells. But in many parts of India the ancient prejudices and customs remain, and the Outcaste leads a life quite separate from his Hindu neighbour. The member of the Depressed Classes owns no land, not even the diminutive plot on which his hovel is built. For the most part he leads a precarious existence working on the land of the inhabitants of the neighbouring Hindu village. Many of them sell their labour in return for a small payment of grain or rice. As is to be expected, in view of their circumstances, they are prone to thriftlessness and are often intemperate. They are perpetually in debt, and in return for a small loan a labourer will bind himself to work for his creditor for life and thus reduces himself to the level of a slave.

Who is responsible for this miserable lot of the Untouchables? The Untouchable is not a fallen man—fallen by reason of his vices or by his disposition. The Untouchables are a suppressed and downtrodden part of humanity. Their lot is miserable because Hindus and Hinduism give them no quarters for betterment, and no opportunity and no hope to rise to manhood. If there are any people who need the care, the attention, the sympathy and the support of the world it is undoubtedly the Untouchables of India.

MY VISIT TO CHINA*

By LORD AILWYN

LORD AILWYN : Your Excellency, Ladies and Gentlemen, I should like to express my most grateful thanks and appreciation for the very kind and all too flattering remarks that you, your Excellency, have made with regard to the work of the British Parliamentary Mission. We all four of us deemed it the very greatest privilege to be asked to represent the British Parliament on this mission, and we have all come back with memories which will not fade. I think that of all the many impressions we have brought back, the outstanding one is the wonderful spirit of the Chinese people. (Applause.)

I am not proposing to make a speech, nor give a lecture or read a paper; but if you will allow me I will give a little talk on some of the things we saw and did in China, and if in the course of my remarks I may not tell you what you really want to know, there will be time when questions come along for you to put them to me, and I will do my best to compete with them.

* Based on an address delivered at the China Institute in London on March 31. Dr. P. W. Kuo presided.

As you know, the mission went to China at the very kind request of Marshal Chiang Kai-shek, the Generalissimo, who asked that a small delegation might be sent. We went by air and arrived at Chungking, the war-time capital of China, after, I think, 111 flying hours, and we covered a distance of 16,000 miles. Our reception at Chungking and the various places we visited afterwards was quite extraordinary—flags and banners and bunting everywhere. People lined the streets, waving little British and Chinese flags, and there were portraits of His Majesty the King and the Prime Minister in nearly every room we entered. We were showered with gifts of all sorts. Nothing more could have been done—nothing was missing in the effort of the Chinese Government and Chinese people to make our stay there one of supreme comfort and interest.

Where one has such a wealth of memories and experiences it is a little difficult to select those which one feels would interest an audience like this the most; but clearly one thing would be our contacts with the schools and universities of China. Where there is so much to admire and respect and sympathize with in the life of China today, I hope it will not be thought invidious to select for a few moments' discussion the work of the educational establishments of China. You probably all realize that the whole life out there—the Government, the industries, schools and universities—the whole pulsing life of the nation has been moved 1,500 miles inland away from the coast and from the invader. There these universities have had to start again in completely new surroundings, lacking equipment, lacking books and lacking suitable and adequate housing. The enthusiasm of all the students, their insistence on putting up with every conceivable form of inconvenience, hardship and difficulty, so long as their studies are not interfered with, is simply more admirable than one can possibly describe; and not only the students, but the chancellors, the professors, the whole faculty, have had to start again from scratch and set up their universities and schools afresh. At Chungking there was Sha-Ping-Pa; there are three or four universities there. Both here and elsewhere their housing is terribly inadequate, and owing to the almost uncontrolled inflation that was going on while we were in China, all these professors and the faculty generally—the salaried officials and black-coated workers—were living in the utmost poverty; but nothing mattered except to continue the education of Young China. We addressed several university audiences, one of them at Sha-Ping-Pa. There we addressed 2,000 students, and we were told there was no interpreter necessary as they all understood English, and one could see they followed every single thing one said with the utmost interest and attention. It was the same on various other occasions. I want to tell you some of the things they were particularly anxious about. The eagerness of the Chinese universities to cultivate friendship and understanding with Britain was very noticeable. At Chengtu, besides the West China University, there are four others which have taken refuge there for the duration of the war. At Kunming, besides the local University of Yunnan, there are again several emigrés, including the University of Peking. The points with which both dons and students were most anxious to impress us were, first, that they all wished to have a fuller understanding of the British war effort and the methods by which the British people, with their own free consent, had been organized for war production. That was their outstanding interest. They felt it necessary that after the war Britain and China should take part in some permanent international system to preserve peace and to increase the prosperity of the world, and they wished very much to know our views on the subject. They were particularly interested in the question whether we ought to begin by reviving some form of a League of Nations, or whether we should start with some system of agreement between the leading Powers now allied to each other, to which other countries could adhere when they were able to undertake and fulfil definite commitments. They all hoped that British universities might devote a little more attention to the study of Chinese culture, civilization and history. They were most anxious that a greater number of English books should be translated and printed in Chinese and *vice versa*. They suggested that funds for the translation and printing of selected books might be provided by the Ministry of Information, the British Council or some organization of that sort. They wanted a more frequent exchange of visits between British and Chinese scientists and scholars. They were looking forward very much to the coming

visit of Professor Dodds, now out there. Professor Hughes, Professor of Chinese at Oxford, was in Kunming when we were there. Both at Chengtu and Kunming we were visited almost every morning by university teachers who hoped our programme might be expanded so that we could devote a little more time to discussions with themselves and with the students. One day, when there had been some hitch in our programme, a crowd of several thousand students waited on a bitterly cold morning from half-past nine till eleven o'clock when we arrived to address them.

I have several letters here which I want to turn over. The first is a letter from Dr. Gordon King which I have received since I got back from China. He was Head of the Medical Faculty of the University at Hong Kong. He is a charming, delightful man, now working at the Central Hospital at Ko-lok-shan. I have letters from the Head of the Gingling College for Women, from the West China University and so on, all stressing their delight at our visit, at our conversations with them, and asking us to do our very best when we got back to improve and extend the relationships between our two countries.

I think perhaps the most interesting social function we attended at Chungking, where we spent fourteen days, was the official banquet which the Generalissimo and Madame Chiang gave in our honour. It was attended by all the high Ministers of State and the Diplomatic Corps. It was of particular interest to meet here the three Soong sisters, whom we found on our arrival all sitting on a sofa together—Madame Chiang, Madame Sun and Madame Kung. We had many conversations with them, and very interesting and delightful they were. The Generalissimo welcomed us at this banquet in a very warm speech, to which we all four replied in a two- or three-minute speech each.

The most interesting personal experience was a week-end we spent with the Generalissimo and Madame in their country house at Huang Shan. There we found an atmosphere of complete informality and great cordiality; both host and hostess went out of their way to make us feel at home. We had some extremely interesting discussions with the Generalissimo. He is very quick in apprehension. He does not speak English, but we were able to carry on easy conversation either through Madame or through Dr. Wellington Koo; and here, when I mention Dr. Koo's name, I want to pay a tribute to the wonderful way he looked after us and fathered us while we were out there. He was on holiday in his own country and had not been home for many years, but he gave up three weeks of that holiday to taking us around. We could not be more grateful to him. He is a most marvellous interpreter. One of the members of the mission, Mr. Jack Lawson, the Labour Member for Chester-le-Street, told the Generalissimo little House of Commons anecdotes with a good deal of slang thrown in, and I am quite sure that nobody but Dr. Wellington Koo would have been able to translate those stories in the way he did. The Generalissimo got the point at once and shouted with laughter. Particularly was he interested in the methods and ways of our Prime Minister. He told us a little about his ideas for the future of China, his intentions for the industrial and agricultural future of his country, how he intends to bring in mechanized farming to the wheat-growing belt in the north, how he feels that the heavy industries should be State controlled whereas the lighter industries should be distributed among rural areas and run as private concerns. Madame Chiang is a very strong feminist, and we had a very lively discussion, I remember, one night on the future of women in political and public life. Madame Chiang expresses herself with great vigour and it is a very exhilarating experience to talk with her.

The Generalissimo knows that he can never achieve political unity in the country unless a new spirit of service and duty is cultivated among the whole people, and with that object in view he has founded a chain of training centres throughout Free China. There is the Youth Corps, which has branches all over the country, and a Central Training Corps for older men. The object of the Youth Corps is to instil the duties of citizenship into the whole of the youth of the country, applying to Chinese life the three principles of Dr. Sun Yat Sen—democracy, nationalism and social reform. It is a semi-military organization. The training is under strict discipline and there is a certain atmosphere of austerity in all its branches. The smartness and the keenness of these young men has to be seen to be believed. Similarly in the Central

Training Corps, which trains men between the ages of 25 and 55 in the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, the organization is run on semi-military lines in an atmosphere of great rigour. They generally have people from one particular profession in each five weeks' course—schoolmasters for one course, lawyers for another, doctors for another, and so on. The dignity of manual labour is upheld, and we saw a party of these men levelling a piece of rough ground while we were there, with men of fifty and over carrying rocks on their shoulders. We saw the parade for the hauling down of the colours at sunset, and the discipline and steadiness in the ranks of these men was worthy of seasoned troops. We addressed them in the drill hall and attended a concert afterwards; and even there we found the same atmosphere of austerity—that is the best word I can use. I went into the concert-room happily smoking a cigarette, until I suddenly realized that I was the only one of that thousand people present who was smoking, and I hurriedly and rather shamefacedly put it away. Even the applause seemed almost "to order" in that highly disciplined atmosphere.

Then I must tell you of a visit we paid to the Yellow River Front in the north-west; we visited the First Division and were immensely impressed with what we saw. We were shown round the trenches and front line positions by the second son of the Generalissimo, Captain Chiang, a very charming young man. Across the river a mile away were the Japanese, but we never caught sight of the enemy, and that was a great disappointment. We inspected another division in reserve, who did us the honour of parading with their colours. An extremely smart, well-turned-out parade it was, and we were enormously impressed with what we saw.

I have referred to the extraordinary hospitality and kindness we received everywhere, and I would like to give one example. I have told this before and apologize to any in the audience who have already heard the story, but it was just typical of the way the Chinese people received us. After a very long and heavy day—we had some very heavy days in the north-west—we arrived at the railway station, to go to our next port of call, at midnight, three hours late on programme time. We found the approaches to the station and platform thronged with no less than 30,000 people, holding up flaming torches; they had been waiting there three hours on a bitterly cold night to bid us Godspeed, and the Governor of Shensi, who was with us, turned round to me and apologized because some of the torches had gone out! I mention that as typical of the charming hospitality and welcome we had everywhere in China. I shall not forget it. Sometimes one had to rub one's eyes and say, "Is this the China of thirty years ago?" when one saw the amazing spirit of unity and discipline that has seized hold of the nation. Then one caught sight of the smiling faces and knew it was the same China.

I feel I have spoken long enough, and it would be better for me to sit down now and ask for questions. I may not have told you a lot of things you would like to hear and perhaps you will ask the necessary questions.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking for himself and the audience, thanked Lord Ailwyn for his address.

A question about inflation was asked, and answered by the Chairman.

A lady asked Lord Ailwyn if the evacuation of the Chinese universities had affected the number of women students.

Lord AILWYN: I know a large number of women students have found their way in company with their male companions from the universities in the east—Nanking, Peking, Hong Kong, etc. I think probably there is little to choose between the mobility of the girls and boys. It was quite extraordinary the number still coming through the Japanese lines to join up with their old universities.

Another lady asked if there was a shortage of food in China.

Lord AILWYN: I am afraid in places food is definitely short; but, as you may know, there are no better agriculturists in the world than the Chinese, and one of the things that impressed us more than anything else was that you never saw a square foot of ground untilled or uncultivated. It was quite extraordinary. Wherever we went there were little terraces on the tops and sides of the hills and every square inch was made use of for food. But where you have 50 million refugees, as in China today, there is bound to be a shortage in places. Still, broadly speaking, I think I

am right in saying that a shortage of food is not one of the principal difficulties under which the Chinese are carrying on.

There are two things I ought to have referred to. One is that we were asked to attend a session of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang. That was a very significant occasion. No foreigner has ever been allowed in to a session of the Kuomintang before, and not only were we asked to attend it but to address it. When we arrived, Dr. H. H. Kung was giving a general survey of the war and the financial position of China, and when he had finished the Generalissimo, who presides as the Leader of the Party, got up and welcomed us in a very charming speech, and we each replied. We went to a tribune and gave each in turn two or three minutes' talk, and afterwards we had the great pleasure of meeting many of the members on what we call in this country the floor of the House. It was interesting to see in the front row of the meeting Dr. Lin Sen, President of the National Government; he sits as an ordinary member of the Kuomintang, with the Generalissimo as Party leader presiding.

The other thing I should say before the meeting closes is a word or two about the Generalissimo. It is quite impossible to describe the way that great man is trusted and respected and beloved by the whole country; it is almost a religious fervour. He is a man of 56 years old, straight as a die, looking far younger than his years, with a very quick apprehension, as I have said before, and a most delicious sense of humour. He has thrown his personality over a whole generation in China, and there can be no doubt that Chiang Kai-shek is one of the outstanding world figures today. It is a very great honour to have met and to have had converse with him.

VILLAGERS AT WAR: LIFE IN CHINA'S RURAL HOMES TODAY

BY IRMA HIGHBAUGH, LITT.D.

(The author is on the staff of the Methodist Rural Service Centre at the small town of Kiennyang, which is south of Chengtu.)

THE Chinese rural home, which during the previous thirty or forty years has largely withstood the impact of modernizing movements, has undergone significant changes as a direct result of the war. One of the greatest is economic. Others are: new freedom for women, which brings new self-respect and a new status; self-activity of the farm family instead of the old passivity; a new honesty, and also new vices; education and literacy for the masses instead of for the few; consciousness of being citizens of a great nation and willingness to sacrifice as individuals and as families for larger interests.

Every rural community has furnished its quota of soldiers, who leave behind wives with added burdens and children without a father's care. Families moving in great masses from occupied areas have changed almost as much as if they had gone to a foreign country, and have in turn affected families where they have gone. Universities and middle schools from other provinces and schools from bombed cities have moved into rural areas. Government and private enterprises have aimed consciously at mobilizing rural families for national resistance. City industry has moved back into the rural home; increased food production has become the primary task of the farmer; and both increased food production and rural industrialization have speeded up farm life, changing its educational, economic and social outlook and often its moral tone.

FARMER IS REAL WAR HERO

Soldiers! What a wealth of emotion this word carries for the rural home. Since 80 per cent. of China's population is rural the vast bulk of the army comes from the

rural home. "The Chinese farmer is the real hero of this war," said Dr. James Yen in a broadcast. "Most of the soldiers come from the farm. At the front farmers are fighting and bleeding for their country; in the rear they are toiling and producing food and clothing for the army and the people." A new quota is ordered, and every family waits to hear whether or not their sons are in the draft. Perhaps Fourth Son or Third Son has been hoping for this release from the hard work and monotony of farm life. "What is so glorious as serving your country and seeing the world at the same time?" tilted a young military truck driver as he started toward one of the hottest spots of the war. "I have seen twelve provinces and expect to see them all before it's over." "What about your family?" he was asked. "Oh, I haven't heard from them for three years. And they must wait to hear from me till the war is over," he replied.

Perhaps the most popular of all war dramas with girls and women is "Mu Lan," named after the Chinese Joan of Arc. This daughter, who became a soldier in place of her father, has become the ideal of many girls today. Kwangsi provided one example of a girls' army in the early days of the war; 250 girls have marched off to the front. We read that in every Kwangsi village women between the ages of eighteen and forty-eight were enlisted in the training camps. Fundamentals of military knowledge and drill were given them in the morning, while a firm grounding in common education, political training and citizenship each had its turn in the evening. This is quite different from before the war, when rural women stayed at home and knew nothing of what happened outside.

Family loyalty has become national loyalty; clan unity has been channelled to national unity; and ancestral devotion has raised soldiering to a religious level. Perhaps the most outstanding example of this and of the way in which a family often supports the draft comes from the coastal province of Chekiang. In the Yu clan, "To every clansman joining the colours the clan apportions a piece of land large enough to produce one picul (110 lbs.) of rice per year. His beneficiaries are allowed to work the land until the soldier comes home. If he should be permanently maimed he may keep it for the rest of his life. In case of death in action his relatives can retain the use of it for fifteen years. . . . On the day the new recruit leaves home an elaborate meeting is held in the family temple. . . . The most touching moment comes when the recruit kneels before the ancestral altar and listens to a speech by the clan elder.

"'You must be loyal to the state, thereby winning glory for our ancestors. You must never be afraid to die. Nor should you desert your ranks. Last of all, you must never surrender to the enemy,' says the clan elder in effect. With the soldier still on his knees the elder hands him a document, certifying that the use of a certain piece of land is hereby conferred on his family and enjoining him never to do anything contrary to the teaching of his ancestors."

SOLDIERS' FAMILIES CARED FOR

Before the war no one would have thought of concerning himself about a needy soldier's family. Now local groups assume the responsibility for such families. Youth groups put on plays and musicals to earn money for them and Christian churches take special collections. School-children are dismissed to put on a flag day to raise funds for them. For example, Mrs. Liu is the mother of three children, one of whom was born after her husband had left for the front. Before leaving, her husband had leased their land for five years at a figure then considered adequate to care for the family needs. But prices soared. The well-to-do family to which the land had been leased was unconcerned about the suffering family. The head of the Pao-chia (administrative units, meaning ten families and one hundred families respectively), who came from their own neighbourhood, called a meeting of the responsible heads of families. "Her husband is fighting for us at the front, and we must see that she and her children are cared for here," was the sentiment of the meeting. Consequently rental rates were adjusted to the current cost of living.

From the earliest days of the war the Central Government has assumed some responsibility for the soldiers' families. Its plan is carried out through the provincial

government and varies with localities. In some places farm co-operatives for soldiers' families are organized. "Members are organized into teams for seed sowing, ploughing and harvesting, and these teams keep toiling until the work of every family that belongs to the co-operative is done." In other places a bonus is given for each newborn baby. Pensions are given to the families of soldiers who die in action. For instance, Mr. Liao met us on the road, and when we stopped to rest he pulled a paper out of his pocket. "The Government doesn't forget its soldiers' families," he said, as he showed us the paper stating that his son-in-law had been killed in Shansi. He told us how he had taken his daughter and her two little children back home to live with him.

It was a New Year's Day gathering. On the drill ground rank on rank of soldiers were drawn up, and there were crowds of school-children. On the platform sat the county magistrate, the head of the soldiery and the distinguished guests. Among the latter were numbers of country women, each proudly wearing a badge; they were guests of the county for the day. These were the mothers of soldiers. Later, in a thatch-roofed country home, with the pig-pen in one corner of the yard and the buffalo in another corner, we found one of these mothers. Proudly she brought out her badge. "Did you see me on New Year's Day?" she asked, as she told us how the Government had remembered her and bestowed honour upon her in front of the thousands of people gathered there that day.

ORPHANAGES TEACH PARENTS

Constantly, indirect education takes place as members of families visit the war orphanages established by Madame Chiang for soldiers' children. As they observe the children there they learn that girls are as important as boys; they see the dignity of labour as the children cultivate vegetables and flowers, or print paper from wood blocks which they have carved, or come in from marketing for the whole group of children. Play and study are carried on with equal zest. Then they go back to put their homes in order, for the simplicity of the orphanage provides an ideal they can achieve.

The type of rural home in guerrilla areas is at once heart-breaking and heartening. The guerrillas were brought into being by the devastation of Japanese occupation. We are told that for centuries the women of China have been bond-servants of the home and their supreme virtue was to be ornate rather than useful. But war has banished all this. China hails a new womanhood. In the fastnesses of the Shansi mountains Chinese girls fight side by side with their menfolk in guerrilla warfare against the invaders; peasant women carry loads of foodstuffs and ammunition to the men in the front lines and march back bearing the wounded men on their brave shoulders. The women and children are making shoes, cooking, entertaining the wounded, acting as sentries or guides. These rural homes are completely mobilized for military service in the most dangerous places of all—behind or adjoining enemy lines.

Another story of bravery is called "A Model Chinese Mother." This model mother had her home in a village in eastern Hopei Province. There she lived with her two sons, sowing, ploughing, harvesting, until the Japanese came. "They burned our house. With the house, all our clothing, our grain and even our pigs went up in flames; so we were left nothing." They fled to a mountain cave, and while they hid there, iron entered into the soul of this sixty-year-old woman. She urged her sons to take up arms against the enemy. Now she lives in a guerrilla camp mending clothes for the men while her sons fight. What a vast change from her former quiet rural life!

But the moving spirit of the 20,000 Chinese guerrillas, who have been troubling the Japanese along the Peiping-Hankow railway is Mrs. Chao, sixty-seven years old, known as the "Mother of the Guerrillas." She vowed vengeance on the enemy for taking all her husband's lands. She, her husband, and four of their children have become guerrillas. Two sons have been killed, and she says her younger son and daughter will join the guerrillas as soon as they are old enough. For all the years of the war she has devoted her whole energy to mobilizing rural women. Bravery and

sacrificial service in dangerous spots have replaced lassitude and indifference in rural homes.

REFUGEES BRING MODERNITY

When we think of how the war has affected rural family life, immediately our minds turn to the thousands of farm families who fled either before the oncoming Japanese hordes or after their homes had been burned and the women abused. What has happened to these families is the question in the minds of everyone. However, families in the areas to which the refugees have fled have been almost as much affected as the refugee families. How? Housing has been one of the biggest problems as masses of people moved in. Not only the cities became crowded, but every rural county seat and market town has its quota. In fact, few rural communities in Free China have escaped this flood of China's most progressive citizens.

As they have moved into these rural communities they have at the same time pushed out provincial ideas and superstitions. These newcomers are called "Foreign Chinese" in many places. "We cannot understand them," the local people say. While incoming people must adjust their Peiping or other dialects to make themselves understood in Hupeh or Szechwan, the local person must attune his ear to this new way of speaking. Thus he becomes less bound by the old ways. The same thing applies to clothing. Not always is it rural folk who move to rural communities; Shanghai and Ningpo sons, with their families, have often gone to the little market town or the open country to live. Shanghai styles of clothing and curled hair have moved into the rural sections, to be secretly or openly admired and copied by the braver sons and daughters of the farming families.

In little rural towns educated women with bobbed hair and port-city dress styles go to market with baskets on their arms. They push their way through crowds of servants marketing for wealthy families, of men from middle-class and poor families doing the day's marketing, of middle-school boys and girls buying for their respective schools, and of restaurant keepers. Diets change for these newly arrived families as they begin to eat locally grown vegetables new to them. In turn, diets change for the local people as the newcomers demonstrate new ways to prepare taro and sweet potatoes, for instance. People in the same yard exchange ideas on preparing foods; the Szechwanese housewife tells the downriver woman how to make pepper dishes, while the northern mother shares her newly made steamed biscuits with the children of the neighbours and explains how they are made. And as the Government increases the production of wheat all learn to eat coarsely ground wholewheat products.

USELESS CONVENTIONS GO

"It's too modern, we cannot stand this!" local elders proclaim with wagging heads or uplifted hands as they see young men and women on the street together. Girls who have travelled for weeks, and sometimes for months, under circumstances that allowed for few reserves, see no need for downcast eyes or hiding within the house when attractive young men come along. Parents who have realized that their daughters know how to take care of themselves have long since lost regard for conventions that are useless. The local elders lament, while their youth look on with approval and go off to school to follow this example of freedom. Masses of students, far removed from their homes in the coastal provinces, have no way to consult their parents about the choice of a mate, and so select their own for good or bad. They greatly influence local rural young people, so that new homes are now started with new ways from the outset.

It is only natural that a man's picture of the ideal girl should undergo a vital change when he needs a mate who can march beside him as a soldier or carry a baby on the trek they must make as they flee before an enemy or from daily bombings. Many local rural teachers marry and continue to teach, bringing the new baby to school, where the children all help to tend it. Marriage and a profession are the standards set before the rural youth. Others, especially the rural middle-school girls, are yearning for a career through which they can serve their country outside the home. "Marriage is a graveyard for girls," some of them would say, as they pause for discussion in the midst of singing war songs that urge them to go to the front. An

occasional sociologically sound book attracts them, and they pour out their dollars to buy books like *How to be a New Woman*, two-thirds of the contents of which are devoted to marriage and the care of children. Thus, changes in housing, diet, language, clothing and marriage have all come through the infiltration of refugees into rural communities.

PRODUCTION IS INCREASED

Added to these influences are the direct efforts of Government and private interests to use the strength of these patriotic and enterprising refugee families to increase production so that the war may be continued and the nation saved. Never before in China's agrarian history has there been such a momentous mobilization as the one being staged today, especially in the inland provinces, for national salvation and self-defence. China's cotton industry has brought about one of the most extensive changes in rural home life. Industrialists lost their factories with the fall of Shanghai when the nation most critically needed cotton for soldiers' uniforms and for gauze medical supplies. They went into the rural areas of Shensi, Kiangsi and Szechwan to start all over again. The result was greatly increased production in spite of greatly reduced facilities. Improved spinning wheels within the reach of common villagers and rural families were introduced. "Scatter the factory into small rural units, so that never again can they all be bombed or lost," was the word that went forth from the Government.

The Chinese Industrial Co-operatives is one of the most potent factors in the movement to scatter industry in small units. Government and private groups have combined in it. The idea of mobilizing the nation's women for production in the rear through the Chinese Industrial Co-operatives was first suggested by Madame Chiang Kai-shek. Paoki, with a large number of women workers evacuated from Hankow during the autumn of 1938, was chosen as a proper site on which to start women's co-operatives. A vast educational programme for women and girls was an integral part of these co-operatives from the beginning. Classes to train leaders in spinning, weaving and dyeing were followed by literary classes that included wartime activities. Reading and writing, counting, civics, common knowledge, and always singing make up the curriculum, while adequate health education and medical care are always provided under the women's department. The co-operatives bring not only a new mode of production but a new way of life, and women's clubs have been organized to bring about better relations between local women and refugee families. The impact of these city-bred factory women and of training in co-operative thinking and working has been tremendous. In addition to education for large groups of women living together, teachers go to small scattered groups of women or to members in their own homes to give lessons and make assignments for further study. For it has become essential to organize large numbers of women to spin in their homes, since cotton thread is needed for the making of uniforms, towels and the warp of army blankets. Five thousand women are organized in one district for this purpose.

WOMEN WIN SELF-RESPECT

The government cotton production industry for soldiers has had a tremendous effect on rural homes of Szechwan. Kenyang, second largest county in this populous province, has 30,000 women spinning at home and several thousand more weaving. Every market day sees long lines of farm women with bundles of spun thread or woven cloth under their arms, waiting their turn at the cotton house to have their work inspected, get paid and check out another batch of cotton to be done the following week. "Two or three women from most homes spin or weave with an average earning of five yuan a week," said Mrs. Hu, the co-operatives' assistant manager for the county. "Usually this is a supplementary income, providing extras for the women or their children, or for materials to go into dowry chests in the case of girls," she continued. Often it is those women's sole income and they spend all their time at it. Sometimes an old woman of eighty years of age will earn her own living. She cannot see well but she spins by feeling, and it puts new interest into life for her. "What are some of the changes that have come to these rural homes as a result of this work?" Mrs. Hu was asked. "New self-respect for the

woman is first," she quickly replied. "She has an economic standing in the home, having some money to spend as she likes, and she feels more secure. Formerly, in some places, if a man didn't like his wife, he could sell her. But now that she is freer he would hardly dare, and if he did, he knows we would demand justice for her. When we first surveyed the country to find spinners and weavers they were afraid of us, thinking we had come to conscript them or to levy a new tax. Now they know we are their friends. They tell us their troubles. And they realize they are helping to win the war. They are aware of themselves as Chinese citizens."

Probably in no other province has there been such intensive work done to improve the home as in Kiangsi. But it is typical and has its counterpart elsewhere. In all ten rural centres (first begun as a peace-time rural reconstruction project) efforts are directed simultaneously toward agricultural improvement, education, health and the extension of co-operative societies. Since the outbreak of the war two new activities have been taken up—citizenship training and the increase of agricultural production. Through a process of adaptation to war needs, Chinese farmers in Kiangsi have been able to produce the lion's share of the gauze needed by wounded soldiers. Before Mr. F. L. Chang, director of the movement, went into the province, the people suffered from malaria. One of the first things Mr. Chang's groups did was to teach the peasants how to make mosquito nets on their primitive looms from the famed ramie thread of Kiangsi. When the war broke out and there was pressing need for gauze, they immediately taught the peasants how to make gauze from the fabric used for mosquito nets. Other activities were the vaccination of 81,000 people against smallpox, the schooling of 20,000 children and 3,000 adults, and the training of midwives among the young farm women.

LIVING STANDARDS RISE

Much emphasis has been given to improvements among women because that is where they are most noticeable and vital, but the farmer and his son have been changed for the better. Increased production of cotton and of foodstuffs has been promoted and directed by provincial and county government research and extension bureaux, vitally aided by such educational institutions as the Szechwan Provincial University Agricultural College, the University of Nanking College of Agriculture and the West China Union University Department of Agriculture. From 700 to 1,000 families each year for the last few years in the Loshan (Kiating) area, south of Chengtu, have been taught improved methods of silk production and grafting and growing mulberry trees. This is work which the whole family must do. Chinese farmers today are consuming better food, putting on warmer clothing and having more money in their pockets than in pre-war days. Better cash returns for their farm products, the development of home industries such as weaving, raising silk-worms and growing wood-oil trees provide the main explanation for the improved lot of the farmer. More hogs and hens are raised and eaten at home. In Szechwan, where there has been an increase of 25 per cent. in wheat production during the past year, more wheat is eaten. Farmers here, as elsewhere in the world, eat what they grow and is in season. This year, to the usual sweet potatoes and peas, has been added wheat.

The Pao chang (civic head of one hundred families) has had the responsibility for promoting production through the ten chia chang (civic head of ten families) of his area. Often this important local official is a young man, in contrast to the elders who governed before the war, and his wife manages the workmen. She also has the responsibility of the farm and sees that production does not lag at home. Shared work for the public good is a new development in rural life, taking women from the home as in the intensive educational programme of Kiangsi, where organized training reaches down to a representative woman of each chia (ten families). Sometimes the training is especially for young people, as that given by a pao chang in connection with one of the Christian rural service centres in Szechwan. The pao chang goes one night a week to the adult class and teaches the young men and women how to conduct a meeting, gives them talks on the Government programme of production, and during the moonlight season takes them out for drill, interspersed with games, war songs and Christian hymns.

Credit co-operatives are one of the explanations for an improved economic situation in the farmer's home in Szechwan. The farmers have been able to borrow money from Government banks to buy land, seed or animals without being hopelessly involved with moneylenders. "Formerly the farmer was only a farmer; now he is both farmer and merchant," said a representative of the Bank of China, who travels into the country to investigate these rural co-operatives.

STUDENTS TELL OF WAR

In Szechwan, where a number of universities are evacuated, scores of college students spend their vacation periods in rural service to help carry on the Government programme of literacy, citizenship, resistance and home education. Even the teams who do no more than teach war songs and give lectures on resistance leave families who can sing and social units with partly awakened minds. The Christian Church in China has co-operated with the Government in an attempt to reach the border tribes and help them to be consciously co-operative Chinese citizens. As a result of these few years of effort, the tribal families now add war songs and games taught by college students to their usual evenings of song and dance. Around their simple hearth fires, as they talk of China's struggle, they feel themselves one with college boys and girls who have lived in their midst. Health service has also been made available throughout the year in many market towns.

New attitudes toward the little child as a person and an understanding of his needs have taken the place of the old feeling that the pre-school child was a live toy to entertain adults and that nothing could be taught him until he went to school. College girls working with the Rural Department of the Y.M.C.A., with the Ginling College Rural Service Station and the Rural Stations of the Canadian and Methodist Churches have multiplied many times the efforts of local staffs in teaching families of the open country. The college girls first have a period of training, and they in turn help to train local girls and young mothers to become teachers in pre-school education.

Half-day nursery play groups are established with local girls and women as teachers and the college girl as head-teacher-director. These groups are located in ancestral halls, in homes or in vacant rooms of the country shop—in any place where the largest number of fathers and mothers can observe them with the least effort. Routines are emphasized and rest periods instituted for these children, who are often ready to drop off to sleep anywhere. This indirect parent education is intensified by weekly meetings of the nursery children's parents and as many friends and relatives as wish to come regularly. Learning nursery songs and games and playing with children limbers up fathers and grandmothers as well as mothers. Then, when discussions of children's problems and needs are over, the father and mother take up their hoes and go with the children back to the fields, singing or discussing the problems of the day. Medical students assist the local midwife with physical examinations for the children and with health lectures.

MOTHERS LEARN TO READ

The mother has new self-respect as she learns to read in the literacy class connected with the nursery group. Her husband has a new respect for her as she cleans up the house, tidies herself daily before going to the field to work, and helps to bring in fresh flowers for the bamboo vase which has been cut at her request. Real equality is achieved between husbands and wives through these shared experiences. A slack season training class is attended by both husband and wife, who then take responsibility for teaching their neighbours citizenship, health, literacy, singing, and child guidance. The better business head of the family is selected to represent them in the credit co-operative, and often it is the wife who attends the meetings and casts the family vote. Husbands and wives take new pride in their own work as they share the fun of an agriculture-and-home exhibit and find their family heirloom bedspread of blue cross-stitch being admired by the neighbours from twenty miles around, their big turnips taking the prize, and sugar-cane of a new species that they have planted and tended together winning prize recognition.

Eager activity instead of old indifference and passivity characterizes these newly awakened farm families. They arrange and carry through the exhibits. The men may put on a war drama, while the women do a "Mu Lan" drama at a Chinese New Year's programme. Families pool their bamboo and other building materials and put up a new co-operatives' building. Or in an orderly way they gather to make a united protest against some local corruption.

The war has brought about some basic changes in the Chinese rural homes, whether they be the families of guerrillas, of refugees or of peasants in Free China. Self-respect and more freedom for women; economic improvement with better food and health; more social life and co-operative activity; more education and equality of men and women; bravery in time of crisis; and the consciousness of citizenship in a great nation and responsibility for its destiny—these are some of the things that have come to the rural home of China. Yet there are still masses of rural families who have not been touched. They wait for those who are already enlightened to lead the way.

THE ROYAL NETHERLANDS NAVY AND THE NETHERLANDS MERCHANT NAVY

Based on talks by P. A. Kerstens, Netherlands Minister of Economics and Shipping, and A. Kroese, Lieut.-Commander R.N.N., in the Overseas Service of the British Broadcasting Corporation.

We Dutchmen who fight on the seas—like our compatriots in the Air Force and Army—have but one aim: to fight with all our might, side by side with the Allies, for the common cause of liberty. With our Mother Country in Europe lost to the Germans and our Far Eastern Empire lost to the Japanese, it is of the utmost importance for us that the defeat of the Axis Powers should be brought about as soon as possible. Moreover, the men of the Royal Netherlands Navy have an additional motive to urge them on to an almost superhuman effort: most of them had to leave their wives and families in German or Japanese hands.

How units of the Dutch Navy supported the land fighting during the German invasion of our country, and how the whole of our Navy afloat—including half-built submarines and destroyers—was snatched away from the Germans and evacuated to British ports to continue the fight, which they never for a moment dreamt of giving up—all these are now well-known facts. Then, again, there is that glorious chapter of naval war off Java's coast when Admiral Doorman stemmed the tide of Japanese invasion in the Pacific. We had serious losses then against vastly superior forces. Brave ships went down with their guns firing to the last, and on the deck of the *De Ruyter* Admiral Doorman was seen saluting as his ship sank.

But today the Royal Netherlands Navy—although composed of fewer ships—is fighting with the mighty Allied Navies on the Seven Seas.

In Western European waters the Dutch units are under British operational orders—also in the Mediterranean, in the Atlantic and in the Indian Ocean—while in the Pacific and Caribbean they are under American operational orders.

In British coastal waters our ships co-operate in local defence and the protection of convoys. Dutch motor torpedo-boats take an active part in attacking German shipping along the West European coastline, while the brave little minesweepers and their crews, once fishing crews, help to clear the entrance to British harbours.

One of these minesweepers has a huge mascot painted on her bridge screen. It represents a lady of ample proportions painted in bright colours on the Navy grey. The lady is boldly sweeping away enemy mines with a large-sized broom. When British visitors come aboard the small warship and ask "Who's that?" then the

prompt answer is "Mrs. Tromp." Tromp, as is well known, was a famous Dutch admiral who, in the sixteenth century, fought several sea battles against the British. On one occasion Tromp is said to have come back to Holland with a broom tied to the masthead of his flagship—meaning that he had swept the Channel of enemy forces. This minesweeper is generally called "Mrs. Tromp," and her record tells of many mines swept out of many dangerous corners.

In the Mediterranean Dutch submarines co-operated with British in attacks on Rommel's supply lines, while in the Atlantic and Caribbean Dutch surface craft are joining in the battle for the sea-lanes against the German submarine packs.

Squadrons of the Netherlands Naval Air Service are operating from bases in Britain, Australia and Ceylon.

Lately the American Lieutenant-General Kenney, Allied Air Commander under General MacArthur, expressed his appreciation of the work of the Dutch air units in the following terms: "They are taking part every day in operations and they are conducting them most effectively. I am not able to go into details about their military activities, but I can tell you that they are co-operating splendidly in every way. They are part of the Allied team and they are doing an excellent job."

Dutch minesweepers are active in Australian coastal waters. And Dutch light cruisers, destroyers, gunboats and submarines, manned by Dutch and Indonesian sailors, are fighting the Axis in the Indian Ocean and the South-West Pacific. Only a short while ago one of these light cruisers, co-operating with an Australian cruiser, sank a German blockade runner in the Indian Ocean.

Less spectacular, but equally important parts of the great naval organization are the administrative branches and training centres. Today there are Netherlands Naval Headquarters in London, Colombo, Melbourne and Curaçao.

Of the training institutes, the Dutch Naval College in England is probably best known; it is really a continuation of the Willemsoord College, formerly established at the Dutch naval base in the northern part of Holland. When the Germans marched in the young Dutch midshipmen were evacuated to England. So were later the midshipmen training at our naval base of Soerabaja when the Dutch East Indies were occupied by the Japanese. In the English Willemsoord they keep the Standard presented to them by the Queen. These boys never contemplated leaving their colours behind in enemy hands, and so this is the only Dutch Standard flying proudly in freedom.

Then there is the Jackson Flying School in Mississippi, United States of America, and several training centres for the Merchant Navy, where sailors are instructed in handling their defence armaments.

Highly specialized personnel of the former Dutch naval dockyards are also assisting in Ceylon, Bombay and South Africa.

Although the complete story of the activities of the Royal Netherlands Navy cannot yet be told, I am sure that from these few facts a general impression can be formed of the part it is playing.

To the disappointment of our enemies the Dutch Navy always managed to come back in spite of severe blows. We are back in the midst of it to help strike that last blow—the knock-out blow—to the enemy. And this war will be our war, not only until our country and our empire are rid of the enemy, but until he has been driven from every single occupied country.

* * * * *

I have been asked to tell something about the Netherlands Merchant Navy, and more especially about its achievements. This is not an easy task. In order to give an accurate impression I should mention figures, assuming, of course, that those figures were correct and not exaggerated. Certain countries like to exaggerate their figures; for instance, when they mention shipping losses. I cannot disclose figures, not even inflated or deflated ones, because by doing so I would give away many facts about the conduct of the war which should better not be known to the scoundrels we are going to beat.

Statisticians will therefore have to curb their impatience and wait until the war is over and its archives are opened.

However, for a description of the work which the Dutch merchant ships have carried out, ever since the Huns thought it expedient to make the fantastic discovery that we were scheming together with perfidious Albion towards their destruction, I can mention one figure. It is sufficiently big to replace many other figures which the censor would never allow me to mention. Since we were invaded, Dutch ships have covered over 55,000,000 sea miles. This means that on each consecutive day of the past thirty-four months our merchant fleet travelled about 55,000 sea miles. I know that this mileage only forms a comparatively small part of the total distance covered by the ships of the United Nations, but I know likewise that it means that our merchant ships have carried several million tons of goods to the United Kingdom and to America.

They have also brought to this country planes, tanks and other military equipment. They have been engaged in bringing across from the American continent to the United Kingdom many troops, and they have carried many thousands of British soldiers to Libya, to Madagascar and to other "second fronts," as well as many thousands of American soldiers to Australia. These Dutch ships took part in the transport of a portion of General Wavell's army to gallant Greece, and a short time afterwards they had to help in its evacuation. They have also run the gauntlet of the enemy's fire and bombs in bringing stores to that unsinkable and unmoving aircraft-carrier known as Malta. They distinguished themselves in the transport of the armies, with their stores, to North Africa. Also Russia has received part—though I must admit it is only a very small proportion—of her supplies through Dutch ships. They have, moreover, assisted in making good the slogan "Britain delivers the goods," and so they have helped this very gallant country in maintaining its trade relations.

I could give many more examples of its manifold duties, which comprise fishing for fish and fishing for mines, conveying bulky cargo across the Atlantic and the Pacific and plying a coastal trade in the United Kingdom waters, and last, but not least, tugging torpedoed ships back to safety. The latter task is far from a pleasant one. Although tugs have very powerful engines they are necessarily slow ships, and therefore pretty helpless should they be attacked by submarines.

My description of the share the Dutch merchant ships, old rusty trawlers as well as luxury liners, take in this war would be incomplete if I did not mention their captains, officers and crews. In the machine-minded world of the 1940's it still requires considerable skill, courage and devotion to duty on the part of human beings to handle a ship. Now I do not want to indulge in any hero-worship, because I know very well that the average merchant sailor—Dutch as well as British, Norwegian as well as American—does not like it because it makes him feel embarrassed. But I must say this, that although these men carry out their work in an unobtrusive way they are nevertheless doing so extremely well. By fulfilling the duties which have been imposed upon them they certainly have as much right as our soldiers, airmen and naval personnel to the gratitude of our country.

May I try to illustrate the conduct of our merchant seamen by recording some very striking examples. Let me begin with a recent one, a deed that has become well known. In my opinion it somehow resembles that splendid act of self-sacrifice of the *Jarvis Bay*, whose commander gave his life in order that the convoy might "bring home the bacon." In a similar manner Captain Horsman of the oil-tanker *Ondina* declined the chance to escape which was offered him by His Majesty's Indian ship *Bengal*. Rather than let this tiny minesweeper, armed only with one 4-inch gun, tackle the two Jap raiders—each of which was armed with six 6-inch guns, torpedo tubes and even planes—on its own, he unhesitatingly joined the unequal battle, and by doing so gave his life in order to assist his comrade-in-arms. I think that the deed of that Dutch merchant skipper, whose tanker in the end managed to reach its destination with its cargo intact, will go down in the annals of my country's history as a shining example of devotion to duty.

Then there is the captain of one of our ships which was hit by a bomb weighing about half a ton. This bomb did not explode, and there was no means of telling whether something had gone wrong. But this captain preferred to risk his life rather than abandon his ship. So he remained on board and again set course for land. The next day he received assistance from the British Navy, and the bomb was delivered to

its proper quarters. You know this captain was decorated by our Queen for what he did, and he still professes not to understand why he was deemed worthy of this honour. A big, burly man he is, whose handshake usually prevents one from writing for the next couple of hours. Then there was the captain and the crew of a ship which had been bombed in very bad weather and, although not hit, had sprung many leaks through near misses. These men did not want to abandon their ship, but clung to it to the very last in a heavy gale. They even did not want to leave it when the forepart had become so waterlogged that the screw was sticking out of the water, and at last the escorting destroyer had simply to order them off. They stuck to their jobs for a full forty-eight hours and with only one purpose—to save *their ship*. The captain was so exhausted that when he clambered down the rope ladder—the last to leave the ship—he slipped and was drowned.

I trust that now I have written enough to prove that our ships and sailors have lived up—as they will in days to come—to the tradition of their flag, the flag of a De Ruyter and of a Tromp, of a Piet Hein and of an Abel Tasman or a van Riemsdijk.

JAPAN AT WAR*

By H. VERE REDMAN

THE CHAIRMAN: I feel much honoured by the wish of the Universities' China Committee to bring me to life again, so to speak, as it is twelve years since I have ceased to exist as far as the Far East is concerned.

I greatly appreciate this particular opportunity of coming to life again, because I feel that it is of very great importance that people in this country should form some more or less accurate idea of what Japan is and what the Japanese people are, and because I believe that the Universities' China Committee have found a lecturer particularly capable of giving you such accurate ideas.

I dare say that this particular audience, who are already interested in the Far East, have some real idea about Japan, but I am quite sure that the majority of the people of this country have uncommonly little idea. Such ideas as they have were, until quite recently, based mainly on *The Mikado*. I think we are more advanced now. Students who have read perhaps *Tales of Old Japan*, or something of that sort, have ideas about the Samurai and the Samurai spirit which figures a good deal in people's conversation and writing about Japan; they talk very much as if the Japanese military classes were like the knights of King Arthur's Round Table, models of chivalrous heroism which all the world ought to follow.

The other idea which they have in their minds, as far as most people are concerned, is that the Japanese are a diminutive people living in a diminutive country. If you look at any old pictures, say in *Punch*, or any kind of symbolical pictures in which Japan is represented, Japan always appears as a small boy of great heroism, fighting against some enormous giant, such as China or Russia or whoever it may be at the moment, but always the point which is brought out is the diminutive size of the Japanese, whereas I do not myself believe that the number of inches of the Japanese stature really has any physiological connection at all. I do not think that because they are small in stature that really means anything from the world point of view. Nor does the fact that their country is not very large mean much either.

So altogether I do think that people have a very vague idea indeed about Japan, and it is very important that they should learn all that they can about that country.

Mr. Redman, when I was in Japan, was a teacher at one of the universities in Tokyo, which I have always thought is one of the very best ways of achieving the

* Lecture delivered at the China Institute in London on January 28, 1943. Sir John Tilley presided.

extremely difficult task of acquiring some inside knowledge of Japanese people. After that he occupied a very prominent position on the very best of the foreign-owned newspapers in Japan, written in English, and also acted as a correspondent of the London papers. So that he had every opportunity of acquiring correct information. On top of that he served for some time in our own Ministry of Information in the Far East, and Hongkong and Tokyo itself, and very unwillingly spent a good many months in Japan since the war with Japan began, where I have no doubt he was able to acquire a good deal of information about what was going on in the country.

I should like to add that I am not giving you an opinion formed *ad hoc*, but an opinion which I formed twelve years ago and which I had occasion to communicate to other people. It was that Mr. Redman is a particularly able and competent person to give his fellow-countrymen accurate information about the country in which he was living. (Applause.)

Mr. H. VERE REDMAN: During my relatively long stay in East Asia I have thought, written and spoken mostly about and not infrequently for Japan. I have expressed some sympathy for Japanese aspirations. I have visited China on a number of occasions in Japanese company. In many ways, I must frankly admit, I have looked at China through Japanese spectacles. I cannot expect these facts to commend themselves or me to our Chinese friends, or to the friends of China under whose auspices this meeting is held. My excuse is the ordinary and human one that, during my stay in East Asia, I have lived in Japan, and I defy any normal human being, reasonably sensitive to the human scene about him, to live long among any people and not get to like them. I flatter myself that I have been able to assess their strengths and their weaknesses, the evil that is in them and the good. But I like them : *tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner*.

Nevertheless, to forgive all does not mean to condone anything, and ever since the outbreak of hostilities in Manchuria in 1931 I can honestly say that I have never condoned any of Japan's actions in China. I have tried to explain them. That is quite a different thing. I felt that such explanations were necessary. I think that they will become necessary again when, after Japan's militarism has been crushed, we and our Chinese and American Allies embark jointly in a spirit of frank co-operation on the stupendous task of reconstruction in East Asia. But I would like to underline that explanation in no way excludes condemnation and that I have always hated Japanese aggression in China as much as I hate it today. (Applause.)

What I feel apologetic about is that, despite my long residence in East Asia, I have been so ignorant of China. Really I know very little more about China than many of my compatriots who have lived for thirty years or so in Shanghai or Tientsin. It is true that I have had the inestimable privilege of seeing a good many of the great works of art and architecture of China, and so I was able to realize quite early in my career one of the fundamental differences between the aesthetic civilization of the two countries—namely, that in China greatness can be big whereas in Japan it can only be little.

It is true that I have had occasion to meet a few, all too few, distinguished Chinese, and so have been able to grasp another fundamental difference between the two nations—namely, that modern China can produce great men and modern Japan cannot. Greatness is something which nobody can define but everybody can recognize. During my stay in East Asia I have met at one time or another almost every contemporary Japanese eminence of the palace, of the army and navy, of the civil service, of big business, of the academic world, and even of that strange world where assassinations are planned and the national policy thereby moulded. And I have felt with regard to all these people that, if I had made a silly pun, or some idiotic remark about women, any one of my interlocutors would immediately have hooted with mirth and produced something equally inane in return. This is a test which, I must confess, I have applied on more than one occasion.

Now greatness should be made of more adult stuff, and in my experience of the Chinese it is. Among the few Chinese I have met, I can remember three or four occasions when I have said to myself, "I am in the presence of a great man."

But, of course, all this does not really mean knowing anything either about China or the Chinese. All I can say on that score is that I wish I knew more, and that I

intend to know more before I die. Let me rather turn to what I do know something about—the Japanese, and particularly Japan at war.

To me the most important thing about Japan's war is the fact that it began, not in 1941, but in 1931. Ever since the outbreak of hostilities in Manchuria in September of that year the Japanese have lived in what they have called *hōjō*—“extraordinary times.” Indeed, since 1933 the times have been officially so designated. These extraordinary times have seen intermittent hostilities abroad and the gradual building up at home of a war-conditioned nation. I propose to examine briefly that process, every part of which I have seen more or less at first hand, for I was in Japan continuously, with the usual intervals for leave, from April, 1927, to the end of July, 1942.

But before doing this it seems necessary to recall two general facts about the Japanese—their pushfulness and their sense of detachment from the rest of mankind. Demonstrably, we British have been among the pushful peoples of the world and, despite all our pre-war bleating about this and that, I firmly believe that we still are. The Japanese, too, like the Germans, Russians, Americans and ourselves, have been and are among the pushful peoples of the world, and the student of Japanese history is forced to admit that this pushfulness was just as intense in the period of isolation which ended in 1854 as it was in the preceding and subsequent periods of adventure on the Asiatic continent.

A sense of separateness from the rest of the world is also possessed by the Japanese to a remarkable degree. The Japanese certainly did not invent the phrase “splendid isolation.” They did, however, achieve to a superlative degree the fact. For two hundred and fifty years they did cut themselves off almost entirely from the rest of the world—an isolation self-imposed, and in many ways it was rather splendid. To it we owe the greater part of the typical Japanese scene in Western eyes—a lacquered, flowered, disciplined, porcelain world, colourful, miniaturish and rather delightful. But it is no part of my purpose here to make an apotheosis of the Tokugawa shogunate, which was responsible for Japan's isolation, but simply to suggest that, in order to go into isolation, the Japanese had to have a pretty large share of that universal conviction among races and nations that they were not as other men are. From earliest times the Japanese have shared the universal tendency to write their tribal myths large, and then, having looked at the writing, have gone on being increasingly impressed by what they have read. It can certainly be said that one of the strongest reasons for going into isolation was that the Japanese felt themselves extremely different from everybody else, and that the effect of the isolation was to intensify the conviction that had caused it.

Japan emerged from her isolation, then, endowed to a superlative degree with two universal characteristics—pushfulness and a sense of separateness from the rest of mankind, a sense very easily transformable into one of superiority. I will spare this audience of persons well acquainted with the Far East and recent developments there any recital of the development of that Japanese sense of superiority throughout the first quarter of this century under the political nursing of Great Britain, and what was in my opinion the far more dangerous all-round flattery of the Americans. Let me rather turn to defining in the most simple terms possible what has happened since.

It is that, first, since the last war, Japan, like most other countries in the world, has had its Socialist and Youth movements; second, that in Japan these movements, as in Germany and Italy, have taken a nationalistic turn with the inevitable concomitant of ambition for foreign domination; third, that there was in Japan, as there was not in Italy, sufficient pushfulness to make these movements internationally formidable; and, fourth, and in my opinion most important, that, unlike Germany and Italy, Japan had all the ideological paraphernalia of such movements ready to hand.

I think that all National Socialists, all corporate statists and the like will subscribe to a principle which may be expressed in Voltaire's *mot* that if the Ruler-God had not existed it would have been necessary to invent him. The Germans invented the Führer on the pattern of the Duce, but it was, of course, quite unnecessary for the Japanese to do anything of that kind. The Emperor Sun God was there to hand. There was no need to invent him. The fanatical, unquestioning loyalty to the

Emperor's person was already there. The identification of him with the State was there. The Nazis and the Fascists certainly had a much more difficult task to build their corporate States at the expense of their neighbours and their own ordinary people than was ever experienced by the Japanese exponents of *Shintaisci*, which is translated as "New Order" abroad and "New Structure" at home.

Let us now consider these four factors in the Japanese situation since 1925 in their natural order and in their interaction. When I first got to Japan in 1927 she was having her first full dose of Socialism, and it was in many respects similar to our own first full dose of Socialism in the more immediate post-war years. You had a few elderly and respectable trade unionists, and even a few trade unions which, if they were not exactly elderly, were at any rate respectable. You had a small Labour representation in the Diet, and everybody very well disposed toward it with that sort of benevolent patronage accorded to the new boy at school. You had your bookshops, particularly those patronized by students, filled to the brim with every kind of Liberal, Socialist and even Communist literature. I remember that in 1928 a life of Lenin was the best seller in one of Tokyo's largest bookshops, and four of my students, all of them destined for executive positions in the big industrial companies, had read *Das Kapital* from beginning to end in the original German. In addition to this you even had the illegal Japan Communistic party, with a few proletarian members and a large number of long-haired student supporters. In short, Japan was having its first full dose of Socialism, with an enormous fermentation of ideas, a great deal of intellectual constipation, and nobody wise enough to administer the salutary dose of salts provided by freedom of expression.

The authorities of those days, a corrupt general, completely sold to the Mitsui interests, General Tanaka, and a lawyer who believed passionately in parliamentary politics within the limits imposed by the Mitsui interests, a certain Dr. Suzuki, were very much upset by all this fermentation of ideas, and set to work to put a stop to it. It was this Dr. Suzuki, incidentally, who first discovered the phrase *kikken shisō*, "dangerous thoughts," which has since become world famous, and who decided to suppress them by police and gendarmerie action.

Dangerous thoughts were thus officially suppressed but, of course, you cannot stop young men from thinking. In Japan you could not stop them from thinking that it is wicked for their elders—some of them, at least—to be wealthy, and to be able to keep motor-cars, geisha and politicians, all for their own private use. You could not stop them from thinking that such wealthy people are corrupt, that they were running the country in their own trading interests at the expense of the agrarian communities, and that they were cutting down unduly expenditure on the army and navy. Then, too, generals and admirals, although not young, certainly did not like to see these reductions of their very necessary services. It made them feel that their country was going to the dogs, and say so. And what they said was of great importance, since in Japan the Ministers of War and Marine, who must be officers on the active list, have direct access to the Emperor and can give their advice independently of the Prime Minister. Meanwhile, lieutenants and captains, who were young, and most of them related to farming families, began to think very much in the same way as the young students who had been Socialists about the corruption of the wealthy but, being men of action, they did not spend long on dangerous thoughts; they translated them into dangerous acts.

The beginnings of "New Structure" were already appearing, with its joint accompaniments of aggression abroad and assassination at home. The actual position was that in Manchuria Chinese were being butchered in the name of the Emperor and for the greatness of Japan, and in Tokyo prominent bankers and high statesmen of the Court were being murdered in the name of the Emperor and for the greatness of Japan. And it was all done by the same people—young people, discontented people, anti-capitalist people, super-patriotic people—and you got the familiar National Socialist interaction: "The nation must expand in order that the capitalist may not contract; the capitalist must not contract in order that the nation may expand."

I am not in any position to assess which of these influences was really the more important, whether the New-Order-in-East-Asia idea dominated the New-Structure-Japan idea, or *vice versa*. All I can say is that there was this constant interaction, very

similar to the sort of interaction that we have seen in Germany and Italy. All that was different about it in Japan was the ease with which the dual idea spread when once the Emperor and Emperor-worship were dragged in as its apparent inspiration, and, secondly, its association with Pan-Asianism.

Pan-Asianism is the one branch of the dialectics supporting modern Japan in her actions which is a complete and conscious fraud. Nearly all Japanese are sincere in their Emperor-worship, most of them in their belief in Japan's destiny to conquer, many of them in their conviction of the need for the sort of national socialism which at present prevails in Japan. But hardly one of them is sincere in his Pan-Asian sentiments. The Japanese are much less conscious of Asia than we are of Europe. They feel as foreign in Peking and Bangkok as they do in London and Berlin, and every non-Japanese is as much a foreigner to them as any other. Japanese leaders have, of course, realized the value of Pan-Asianism as a justification and an actual instrument of their aggressions, and have consequently exploited it to the full. But while the Japanese may have succeeded in deceiving quite a lot of people by their Pan-Asiatic jargon, they have certainly never succeeded in deceiving themselves.

And so, with Japan flouting the League of Nations, building an empire in Manchuria, gaining a foothold in North China, getting partial control there, then making more trouble, and, finally, in 1937 embarking upon the stupendous task of the conquest of the whole of China, I saw developing in Japan itself an entirely new kind of life. The revulsion from capitalism expressed itself in exhortations to austerity on the one hand, and the imposition of austerity in the interests of war economy and war psychology on the other. This combination is an ingenious one, although in Japan it was largely ingenuous. Overseas adventure was obviously not going to yield dividends in the form of prosperity for many years to come and, in fact, most of the people were much worse off than they had been under the old capitalist parliamentary Mitsui régime. It was consequently ingenious to stress the moral value of frugality. Moreover, Japanese leadership quickly grasped the fundamental truth that, when you impose economic restriction, it is good to keep in mind the moral discipline to be derived therefrom. What was actually done was that restrictions of consumption were imposed up to the limit of economic necessity in the interests of war economy, and also beyond those limits in the interests of building up war psychology, so that the people were actually living more mean, as the Scotsman would say, than was necessary. This, I should add, was fully in accord with Japanese tradition, for the Japanese, as Sir George Sansom has reminded us, have throughout their history been prone to look for moral solutions of economic problems.

The result was the creation of a new type of individual. Gone were my long-haired students and the famous modern boys with their hair uncut in tribute to Karl Marx or James Joyce or just occidental fashion. They were replaced by close-cropped, grimmer creatures, often describing themselves as human bullets, and they looked like that, fellows firmly convinced that the more uncomfortable they were the tougher they were, and the tougher they were, the better they were, for as a result of it all Japan would become the greatest nation in the world, all the corners of which would be under one Japanese roof, just as the first Emperor is alleged to have promised six hundred and sixty years before Christ.

Such were the results of what was called "spiritual mobilization," and at present the individual Japanese at war, whether in the field, factory, the home or on the farm, is a completely war-conditioned creature, passionately loyal to his Emperor, passionately eager to live, fight, suffer and die for his country, deprived by his nationalistic frenzy of all signs of individuality, conscious only of his membership of and duty to the State.

This has been true of many Japanese since 1931. It has been true of most Japanese since 1937. All that happened in December, 1941, when the war with us began, was that it became true of almost every Japanese. During my eight months in prison, I met among my various custodians and inquisitors quite a number of various types of Japanese, but in this fundamental attitude towards the outside world they were all the same.

I cannot stress too strongly that now Japan at war means substantially that all Japan is at war. There may be a few business men who would like to spend their

money on the superior consumers' goods which they now no longer see and would like to run their businesses in their own way. There are no doubt a few scholars who would be glad to be able to say what they think about this, that and the other. There are no doubt a few aristocrats who would like to enjoy the eminence which once was theirs in the national politics and the national economy. There is certainly in Japan at war a good deal of nostalgia, but nostalgia never has been to any man a creed. A creed to a Japanese is what you are willing to die for. In all my experience I can think of only two Japanese so-called Liberals who would have died for what they believed in, Ozaki and Minobe. The rest are rather ineffective New Orderists, with their feet firmly planted on the nationalistic band-wagon and their faces turned, half shamefacedly, towards the good old days. There are a few Communists who would be willing to die for their beliefs, but most of them have already done so. For the rest, the people as a whole firmly share the nationalistic ideal and believe passionately and enthusiastically in the national way of life.

This way of life is one which we in normal times could not and would not want to share. We do not believe that life should be like that. We believe that this negation of human personality is a thoroughly evil thing. But a nation of seventy-three million people imbued with these ideas is a very formidable enemy indeed. This is what we are up against, and in my opinion it will take all our resources—material, intellectual and moral—even to begin to beat it.

That brings me to my final point. This nationalistic frenzy, built on ancient legends and modern aspirations, which I have just described, makes the Japanese not only an exceedingly tough proposition; it makes them an altogether untreatable one. Mr. Joseph Clarke Grew, the last American Ambassador in Japan, who has seen most of the period I have passed in review, has recently delivered a series of addresses to his compatriots on Japan and the Japanese, addresses which prove him to be in my opinion the most authoritative and authentic voice on Japan in Anglo-Saxondom today. In the course of one of his talks he said of the Japanese: "You cannot treat with such a people; you can only defeat them." There never was a truer word spoken about modern Japan. It is probably truer of modern Japan than it is of Germany. The whole people are completely indoctrinated with this idea of their destiny to conquer by military force. It has therefore to be demonstrated, and demonstrated beyond all possibility of equivocation, that this "way of the warrior" has been the fatal way for Japan, that all this military mania has brought the country to ruin and humiliation. Only on such a basis will it be possible to attempt any sort of reconstruction in East Asia. Only on such a basis will it be possible in my opinion to harness to the service of mankind as a whole those qualities of kindness, diligence and innate artistry of the Japanese, which I have learned to appreciate, and which, despite my few unhappy experiences at the end of what was on the whole an extremely happy life in Japan, I still appreciate.

We have to defeat Japan completely; then, and then only, shall we and the Japanese get a little peace. (Applause.)

INDIAN STATES: CONSOLIDATION AND PROGRESS

(BY A SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT)

It cannot be doubted that the decision, announced in April, that the small States in Western India and the Gujarat States Agency are to be merged in larger States possessing similar geographical, economic and political affinities, is in the permanent interests of the peoples and rulers of the territories concerned. Approximately four hundred of the smaller units are affected, and the States which are assuming wider responsibilities under this statesmanlike and timely merger include Baroda, Nawanagar, Bhavanagar, Junagadh, Gondal and Dhrangadhra. As outlined in the official announcement, the threefold justification for the consolidation is the slenderness of the

resources available to the smaller units, their reluctance to co-operate, and the consequent lack of amenities for the subjects. In other words, "experience has shown that these units, not only when unaided but when grouped together as 'thanas' or under the close supervision of Political Agents, are unable to achieve the conditions of administrative efficiency which alone can justify in them the perpetuation of any form of hereditary rule." In effect, while the total area under princely rule remains (with slight exceptions) undiminished, the inhabitants of the areas merged will now have the opportunity to share in educational, social and economic facilities hitherto beyond their reach. The principle of paramountcy has never been given a more beneficent application.

The policy thus initiated has been promulgated after prolonged investigations and discussions and after giving the fullest and most patient consideration to alternative solutions. As the communiqué recalls : "The problem assumed prominence in 1933 in connection with the special discussions which culminated in the Government of India Act of 1935. It was eventually decided to be impracticable to form the areas concerned into a local confederacy for purposes not only of removing their administrative deficiency but also of facilitating their inclusion in any federal arrangement applicable to India as a whole." Addressing the Chamber of Princes in March, 1939, His Excellency the Crown Representative emphasized : "In no case is the need for co-operation and combination more pronounced and more immediate than in the case of the smaller States. Those States whose resources are so limited as virtually to preclude them individually from providing for the requirements of their subjects in accordance with modern standards have, indeed, no other practical alternative before them. I would take this opportunity to impress on Rulers of such States, with all the emphasis at my command, the wisdom of taking the earliest possible step to combine with their neighbours in the matter of administrative services so far as this is practicable. In doing so they can rely upon receiving all possible assistance and advice from me and my advisers. But the need is urgent and pressing. It calls for prompt action on the part of all those concerned, and it is, in my judgment, vital in the interests of smaller States themselves that no time whatever should be lost in taking the necessary steps."

Reiterating the need for collaboration when addressing the same organization last year, His Excellency sounded a note of warning to the smaller States, and declared : "I regard it as my duty to repeat in as few words as possible what I have said in previous addresses to this Chamber regarding the absolute necessity, so far as smaller States are concerned, for some form of co-operative measure to secure a standard of administrative efficiency which is beyond their individual resources. In my last address I remarked that steps to this end had already been taken in many parts of India with visible though not as yet spectacular results. The last year has seen further and encouraging progress. But I regret to observe that the progress has been mainly apparent in one area only. Elsewhere there are schemes to this end under consideration; but there are other large areas comprising many States which in my judgment can certainly not afford to stand aloof in this matter where no sign of this vital principle of co-operation has yet begun to emerge. It is my duty therefore to urge all concerned to press forward in this matter and to realize that when I urged upon this Chamber the necessity for some form of pooling of sovereignty I did not do so without full appreciation of the sacrifices involved nor yet of the gravity of the eventual consequences which my advice was designed to avert." It may be noted, as an additional justification for the consolidation which has followed this admonition, that the 400 units merged cover an area of about 7,000 square miles, with an aggregate population of approximately 800,000. As already emphasized, the merger does not reduce the area or population remaining under princely rule, but the reduction in the number of separate units may be gauged from the classification of the States—made by the Butler Committee and accepted by the Simon Commission in 1930—into 215 States and 327 estates, jagirs and others. As has been remarked in another official document, "India has seen the birth and extinction of innumerable dynasties," and, although the methods change, the process continues, and need not, even now, be regarded as necessarily complete. Elsewhere the pursuit of administrative efficiency is demonstrating the desirability of larger units, and from this world-

wide trend the smaller, less progressive and resourceful States cannot rank as immune.

There have been complaints from Congress circles that the small States involved have been merged in other States rather than in contiguous Provinces in British India. But, apart from traditional considerations, there are certain aspects of the present situation which render such a criticism particularly inapposite and inopportune, especially in view of its political origin. Unlike the Congress organization, whose puppet Ministries jettisoned their public responsibilities in pursuit of party aims (including sabotage of India's war effort), the Indian States—while making their full contribution to India's mobilization of men and materials in pursuance of the United Nations' conflict with the Totalitarian Powers—are also continuing their "nation-building" activities, as far as war conditions permit. In both these vital spheres, it is legitimate to claim, the Indian Princes have shown themselves more reliable and authentic interpreters of Indian sentiment and interests than the pacifist-cum-defeatist leaders of the Congress Party, who will be unable to claim any share in the victory, which is now certain, or in India's contribution to it. When the time comes to determine India's post-war Government, those whose views will be entitled to most weight will be those who are making the fullest contribution to the country's preservation from external aggression, and in that galaxy the Princes and peoples of the States will hold an honoured place.

I have pointed out that, notwithstanding war conditions and requirements, and indeed to some extent aided by them, India's "nation-building" activities are not being entirely suspended. On the contrary, it is hardly too much to say, India is passing through something almost approximating to an economic and financial revolution. That within the short space of three years she has moved from a debtor to a creditor status, thereby achieving the substance of financial independence, is now common knowledge. Concurrently, as in the first World War, India is also making giant strides towards the fuller development and diversification of her industrial production. Such advances are happy auguries for post-war India, both as regards her economic welfare and her political stability—two objectives which are necessarily closely allied. In this direction the Indian States are moving in step with British India.

In Baroda, as indicated in the Administration Report for 1941-2, it is satisfactory to learn, the agricultural community has, on the whole, benefited by the war. The growers of commercial crops, in particular, have benefited. Industries are working to full capacity to meet the wartime demands of defence services and of the civilian population and to fill the gaps created by the interruption of imports. Existing industries have expanded and new ones have arisen. By mutual adjustment and arbitration wages have been raised in all factories. Only cottage industries have suffered a setback, owing to the difficulty of getting artificial silk, dyes, etc. A close survey has been made of the increase in the expenditure incurred by the agriculturist which operates as a set-off against increased income received by him, and the result is to show a net relative advantage. The exception is in regard to short staple cotton, and tobacco, and inducements have been offered to growers of these to switch over to food crops. In pursuance of the "Grow More Food" campaign it is hoped to bring 71,000 acres of cultivable waste lands under cultivation, yielding approximately 9,500 tons of food grains. The total area of land switched over from commercial crops to food crops was about 161,000 acres.

Although defence services have involved additional outlay, the finances of the State have been satisfactory on the whole, and the activities of the development departments have continued progressively, the policy of His Highness' Government also being to make increased allotments for nation-building departments. A notable feature is that though State revenues have increased in recent years, the *per capita* burden of taxation has appreciably decreased.

The sixty-four years that the late Maharaja was on the throne was, as the Administration Report says, "the golden period in the history of the Baroda State. His achievements were numerous: a scientific system of land revenue, survey and settlement was introduced, great departments of State formed, social laws framed and enacted, compulsory education enforced, important programmes of rural and industrial develop-

ment carried out, the social services of the State extended, a network of railways constructed, the port of Okha developed, and, above all, a tradition of just and good government firmly established. His Highness was assisted by a succession of able Ministers like Sir T. Madhavrao, but the inspiration was always his. Modern Baroda is the great and fitting memorial to Sayajirao." The noble tradition thus established, including the allocation of large funds for village and other welfare schemes, is being maintained by his successor, "whose reign is already famous for the permanent reduction in land revenue to the extent of over twenty per cent., the constitutional reforms and the Sayajirao III Memorial Trust of a crore of rupees, the Maharani Shanta Devi Trust Fund for the medical relief of women and children, and the extension in the social services of the State."

Aided by a representative Legislature, the Baroda Executive is promoting social reforms, of which the Child Marriage Prevention Act is a significant example: a measure which, although the total number of marriages has more than doubled, has more than halved the percentage of child marriages since 1916. "Thus the age of marriage has obviously risen on an average by about five years. Legislation has a great deal to do with this, though, no doubt, the influence of social changes, the pressure of economic circumstances and the leavening influence of education have certainly played an important part." Then again, it is claimed, property legislation has improved the status and material position of women in Hindu families. It is, however, in respect of the extension of education that Baroda has made its most significant contribution to social progress and welfare, and in this field its leadership and achievements remain an inspiration even to British India. In 1941-2, there were in all 308,777 pupils under instruction in 2,548 educational institutions. Of these, 188,350 were boys and 120,427 girls. Co-education, introduced a long time ago, is becoming increasingly popular. The adult literacy campaign, started in 1939, is being carried on, and so far 30,073 adults have been educated in these classes. Health measures include compulsory physical training, which was extended to all schools in 1940-1. In primary schools trained teachers now number 79.3 per cent. of the total strength—an assurance of education of the highest standard—and to enable them to play a useful part in village life, primary school teachers are also trained in the elements of village improvement, and refresher courses for this purpose are held every year. The policy of developing the rural library system as an essential complement to mass education is being steadily pursued. The number of village libraries now stands at 1,301. Primary schools number 2,353, with 274,602 pupils, while pupils in secondary schools number 29,205, including 2,959 girls. Baroda now claims three colleges—an arts and science college, a secondary teachers' training college, and a commerce college, the latter started last year. There are 120,427 women under instruction. The depressed classes, who form 15 per cent. of the population, are given extensive facilities for education; in fact, preference is given to students of this community for admission to all Government institutions, while special scholarships are reserved for them in college and secondary schools.

In Hyderabad, as revealed in the latest report of the Medical and Public Health Department, roughly 12 per cent. of the population live in urban and 88 per cent. in rural areas, and of the former nearly 29 per cent. live in the capital city of Hyderabad. In that city the Improvement Board, since its inception in 1914, have made great efforts to clear slums and reconstruct healthy dwellings on the sites so cleared. Government have issued circular orders with regard to town and village planning in urban and rural areas in the districts, and building bye-laws are being enforced in all towns with a population exceeding 5,000. District Boards and Municipalities are improving big towns by town extensions in consultation with the Public Health Department. All town improvement and development schemes, including those of rural reconstruction and labour colonies, are changing, though slowly, as a result of rural uplift work launched by Government in various parts of the Dominion. Health education is the basis of the entire health programme, and, as the report emphasizes: "The extent to which we are able to get the individual citizen attuned to an understanding of the problem and its solution will be the yardstick for measuring permanent accomplishments. Our main hope lies in teaching the younger generation to do and think for themselves and pass their knowledge on to succeeding

generations. With this object in view the Public Health Department carried out an incessant health propaganda by all the means at its disposal during the year."

In Mysore, Government have laid down a programme of rural reconstruction on a wider scale than at present, so that within a definite period of five years the general standard of panchayet administration and of village amenities may be improved. Labour legislation is also being promoted and enforced, and is justified by the circumstance that the decade ending 1941 witnessed a very rapid increase in the number of industrial enterprises in the State. Prior to 1941 there was no statutory machinery in Mysore for the settlement of industrial disputes. In that year the Labour Emergency Act created machinery for the peaceful and speedy settlement of industrial disputes and sought generally to promote the welfare of labour. This measure was permanently put on the Statute Book in 1942. The Act confers the right of association on labour. Fifty-seven undertakings have come within its scope, and labour associations have been registered in seventeen industrial undertakings. The Labour Department has promoted agreements in sixteen industrial disputes. Government have also extended the scope of the Factories Act so as to bring practically all industrial labour within its ambit.

It is therefore clear that the States are not making war exigencies a pretext for neglecting peacetime responsibilities and objectives, and in that respect they are playing a more praiseworthy part than their political detractors in British India, whose aberrations have left some of the most important Provinces for nearly four years without responsible Governments, and therefore with abnormally restricted opportunities for going forward with social welfare programmes. Speaking generally, the Dewans, who are now guiding the destinies of the leading Indian States, are a stronger team than any who have previously held office, and, in view of the progressive policies they are pushing through, the comparison between princely and British India is, in many respects, tilting in the former's favour, and the Provinces will have to look to their laurels. This applies particularly to education, in which respect, as tested by the literacy figures disclosed in the 1941 Census, the British India figures, as the Census Commissioner emphasizes, are "left far behind by Travancore and Cochin." In these two States, which for this purpose are grouped together, largely on account of social connection, there is a literacy figure over the whole population of 45 per cent., representing 56 for men and 34 for women. The latter is four times the highest from any Province of British India. Here at least is one important sphere in which the States are leading the Provinces, not *vice versa*. And there are other fields of activity to which the same comment applies.

THE NEW TURKEY

By IZZET-MELIH DEVrim

(The writer is one of Turkey's leading authors, playwrights and lecturers. His writings include works in French and translations from French authors. The following is a translation from a recent brochure entitled *La Turquie Nouvelle—Kemal Ataturk, historique des réformes, Ismet Inönü*.)

WITH some justification it may be said that the new Turkey came into existence in the reign of Suleiman the Magnificent, whom the Turkish people know as the "Legislator." And if his successors had been worthy of him, Turkey would never have been outstripped by the other States of Europe.

We should recall in this connection the disastrous part which the Sultana Roxelana played. Ambitious, wilful and passionate, she induced her husband, who was blinded by love of her, to have his eldest son, Mustafa, assassinated, a youth whose intellectual powers and whose talents were famous, and to grant the succession to the throne to her own son, the worthless Prince Selim. This youth, Selim II., called the Fair, was

given to debauchery and drunkenness, and it was in his reign that the decadence began which in the nineteenth century took on such serious proportions—even disastrous, having regard to the scientific inventions and the progress of machinery, which the Turkish people ignored or neglected.

It is, nevertheless, only fair to mention the efforts at reform which some of the Sultans made. Ahmed III., who reigned from 1703 to 1736, had the good fortune to be advised by a Grand Vizier as exceptionally able as was Nevshchirli Ibrahim Pasha and was broad-minded enough to take a Frenchman, the Count de Bonneval, now become Kumbaraji Ahmed Pasha, into the service he valued most, the Corps of the Janissaries. Moreover, he issued an Imperial decree for the adoption of printing. The first press was opened in 1729 and began its activities with a dictionary called *Van Kulu*. We may note that the first Turkish books were printed in the reign of the same Sultan at the press of the French Embassy.

It was also in the reign of Ahmed III. that the School of Artillery was started with the aid of the French General, Baron de Tott. Finally, the Dutch painter Karl van Moor came to Turkey, where he painted some of his most famous pictures.

Selim III. was raised to the throne at the age of twenty-eight, at the time when the rumbling of the Revolution of 1789 was heard in France, to spread both in that country and abroad the ideas of liberty and justice. Possibly influenced by these ideas, but at any rate uneasy at the backward state of the country, Selim III. thought out a liberal and progressive programme, which he pursued energetically in spite of his political preoccupations, such as the war with Austria and Russia and the invasion of Egypt by the armies of Napoleon. These schemes were brought to nothing by the revolt of the Janissaries, which was fomented by an illiterate fanatic, Kabakchi Mustafa, and Selim himself was assassinated in 1808.

It was not the first time that the Janissaries had played a decisive part in the fate of the Empire. This redoubtable militia had already deposed several Emperors and Grand Viziers; everyone trembled when they laid down their arms as a sign of rebellion. They ended up by using them wrongly and their intrusions into politics became intolerable. They became undisciplined. The Sultan Mahmud II. saw that he must put an end to this state of affairs and ordered their destruction in 1826. Then he began the organization of a modern army and introduced conscription.

Rashid Pasha, whom the Turks call The Great, was Mahmud II.'s ambassador in Paris and in London towards the close of this reign or about 1839. He was recalled to Istanbul to take up the post of Foreign Secretary, but before leaving England and France he had conversations with Lord Palmerston and with Guizot, who promised him the help and friendship of their Governments, provided that Turkey would undertake seriously the reform of her administration and of the Department of Justice. Rashid returned full of hope and enthusiasm, but just then Mahmud died.

An old Pasha, Husrev, famous for his power, his fanaticism and his wealth, forced himself as Grand Vizier on the young Sultan, Abdul Majid, who came to the throne at the age of eighteen. The new Sultan was furious and sought impatiently to get rid of Husrev Pasha. While this was going on, Rashid Pasha reached the capital. The late Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mahmud II., dazzled by his tour in Europe, went to Husrev and explained the happy results of his diplomatic work in France and England. Naturally he laid stress on the need for modernization and reform. Husrev listened carefully and, without expressing any opinion, gave him a note for the Sultan which he wrote and sealed there and then.

Rashid waited upon the Sultan, who read the petition of the Grand Vizier, smiled and asked the Pasha many questions about his mission and his views. The young Sultan took fire at the intelligent liberalism of Rashid Pasha and appointed him again to be Foreign Minister; then, roaring with laughter, he handed him the note of the Grand Vizier. The latter declared that, failing an order to the contrary from His Majesty, he would have the miscreant's head cut off, this Rashid with his European subversive notions. You can well understand that the end of Husrev's career as Grand Vizier was not far off.

Abdul Majid, acting under the advice and encouragement of Rashid Pasha, issued a series of laws for reform and progress, known as the *Hatti-Humayun* or Imperial Rescripts of *Gul-Hané*. These reforms in the administration and the legislature

were so daring in relation to the understanding of the people that the Grand Vizier is said to have made his will before going to *Gül-Hané* to deliver a public lecture!

These attempts at reforms had no lasting results, for the succeeding Sultans, especially *Abdü'l Hamid II.*, were narrow-minded despots. Moreover, what was important for the future, the new decrees dared not attack either the old traditions and the social laws or the religious foundations of the State. So we can say that *Kemal Atatürk* was the reformer awaited ever since the death of *Suleiman the Magnificent*.

Imperturbable in faith and method, *Atatürk* destroyed the worn-out institutions which impeded the march of the people towards progress. First the temporal power was separated from that of the Khalif and the rôle of the latter was confined to spiritual affairs. Soon afterwards the Khalifate was abolished and the whole Imperial Family was exiled. With the adoption of the Swiss Code, the whole social outlook was entirely altered; there was no more legal polygamy; questions of divorce and inheritance were regulated; the woman took her share in the national polity; she became a workwoman, an employer and member of the municipal councils. Finally, she who according to the *Sheriat* law could only marry a Mussulman is now free to marry the man of her choice whatever be his religion.

Atatürk was one of those men who never overlook details, for whom no matter is too small; *Napoleon I.* dictated the rules of the *Comédie Française* at the height of the Russian campaign; *Atatürk* abolished the *fez*, which was inconvenient and out of date, in favour of the hat when occupied with the serious question of *Mosul*.

We know the gifts of vision which he had. I myself assisted at an example of this mysterious force which unrolled the future before him; in 1928 he decided to replace our ancient script by Latin characters. Even the most progressive amongst us were afraid on the eve of this unheard-of step and envisaged a long period of transition. But *Atatürk* said: "You will see that the change will take place much sooner than you think; thanks to the new alphabet, everyone will be able to read and write in the space of a few years."

I want to pause for a moment on this reform of our script.

For many centuries the Turks used the Arabic alphabet, which consisted of thirty-four letters and, like Hebrew, is written from right to left. Since Turkish contains many Arabic and Persian words and since our literature was based on these two languages, the alphabet has to be capable of rendering all the shades of pronunciation of the foreign words. These shades were especially refined in the reading of the *Koran*. There were, for example, three kinds of "s" and four of "z." But in the current speech of Turkey these triplicated and quadruplicated letters ended by having the same sound and only served to complicate the spelling. Further, as the original form of the words borrowed from Arabic and Persian had been carefully preserved and as the spelling of these two languages has hardly any vowels, the pronunciation of each word has to be specially learned, so that those capable of reading the learned texts without mistakes of pronunciation were very rare.

The new alphabet, with its Roman characters, consists of twenty-seven letters and is essentially phonetic. It has no "q" and no "x," but contains a "j" which is the Latin "c," a "ch" which is written "ç," a "sh" written "ş," and a "gh" which is simply a "g." Besides facilitating the teaching of Turkish, the reform has done away with a kind of Chinese Wall which separates our way of writing from that of most civilized nations.

Lovers of the picturesque who used to admire the old wooden quarters, the crooked streets with their rough surfaces, the motley costumes and coiffures, may regret our ancient script with its mysterious and strange patterns. We may note, in passing, that it gave rise to a regular art of calligraphy. In the course of centuries, and no doubt because any representation of the human figure is forbidden by Islam, the art of painting and sculpture has never flourished among us, and so many calligraphists have become celebrated in the East. Several kinds of writing had each its masters. I was myself the pupil of a famous calligraphist, *Izzet Effendi*, and I shall never forget the admiration and even delight with which he contemplated the black-board on which he had just written a fine specimen of handwriting.

To complete the series of reforms which we owe to the genius of *Atatürk*, we

should add the adoption of weights and measures, the reciting of the Koran in Turkish instead of the original Arabic, the linguistic and historical works which were undertaken under the driving force of the Great Chief, and which were concerned with researches into the origin of the Turks and the purging of the language of Arabic and Persian words. In the last years of his life he suppressed the titles of pasha, bey, hanum, effendi and aga; he forced everyone to adopt a family name and he introduced women to political life. The Turkish woman, having left the seclusion of the harem, not only became in the course of some fifteen years a municipal councillor. She has received her full political rights: she has the vote and can be elected; the Grand Assembly of Turkey contains a certain number of female deputies.

Before completing this rapid sketch, I should like to recall here my notes on an evening which I spent at the Dolma-Bagche Palace on the banks of the Bosphorus in 1930, an evening which is in some way an epitome of the new Turkey within the framework of the ancient Sultans.

The crimson fire of the sunset was streaming over the Bosphorus when we disembarked at the marble quay of the Seraglio. Kemal Atatürk received his guests in the great hall on the first story, which was decorated with majestic marbles and over-gilded in indefinite, nondescript styles which the zealous craftsmen imagined was to the taste of the Ottoman Sultans. But our eyes were charmed now and again by the rich colouring of a carpet, by the beauty of a vase or by a fine painting by Corot, Boulanger or Fromentin.

The Chief had gathered about him, instead of his usual suite, some young representative families of new Turkey: Ministers, deputies or writers, whose young wives were for the most part as well educated and as elegant as their sisters of the West. At the end of half an hour the President of the Republic gave his arm to the lady who had been allotted to him and we went to the Throne Room, where the table was laid. This vast hall has seen almost all the ceremonies of kissing hands since the time of Abdul Majid until the last Sultan.

As I passed along corridors of the Palace, admiring its high pillars and its gigantic proportions, I recalled the shades which inhabited this imperial residence: monarchs whose absolute power was made disastrous by their fatal degeneracy; Court dignitaries and chamberlains who often had no other ideal than to exploit the fears and the fixed ideas of their masters. A little farther on behind the Throne Room were the old apartments of the harem, narrow and badly aired, where hundreds of women lived in a primitive world and with no outlook. The Kadin Effendis—that is, the legitimate wives of the Sultan—were at daggers drawn with one another; the favourites and slaves waited their turn for favour, and some of them faded like flowers deprived of air and sun, longing with regret for the open spaces of their own beautiful villages.

Now there was no woman prisoner in the Palace. The Chief of the State was seated at a table served in the European manner with his friends and guests of both sexes. The women were wearing evening gowns made by Patou or Lanvin. The conversation ranged over political, social and literary subjects. Each expressed his opinion, and the Chief listened and replied pleasantly with that charm which all knew who had had the privilege of coming into contact with him.

Atatürk said: "It is said in Europe that I am a bloody dictator. That is absolutely false. I am a man of great feeling and I could not kill the smallest bird; but I am a man of thought and ideals and in matters which concern the existence of my country I would trample on the body of my best friend to attain my end."

He also said: "I attach the greatest importance to studies and researches which bring to light the power and the civilization of the Turks in the most remote periods of history. Our young people should know their ancestors well and be proud of them."

After dinner, Atatürk opened the ball. The couples danced in this ancient Throne Room, the very atmosphere of which seemed surprised at the sound of jazz. The entertainment continued far into the night. Towards morning we were again seated round the table, a little tired and a little dreaming, when we heard from the Bosphorus a young and melodious voice singing a love song, one of those Turkish love songs in a minor key whose passion and sadness stir the emotions so powerfully. At the end of the hall, just in front of Atatürk, the dawn was breaking, and athwart the marble

pillars, through the enormous door which opened on the sea, could be felt the quiver of the waves as they were touched by the first rays of the sun.

Atatürk listened, lost in profound meditation amid the smoke of his cigarette. The light of the sun became brighter and stronger; it lighted up his face and his sea-blue eyes with their steely glitter. In this Palace of the Emperors at this beautiful morning hour, the meditation of the Chief, listening to the sad, far-off song, seemed a world in itself. But who has ever fathomed the inner thoughts of Atatürk, the incomparable Marshal and the all-powerful Chief of State?

This extraordinary man, whom nothing seemed able to touch, who had so often braved death, was alas! struck down by an incurable disease and died in this same Palace of Dolma-Bagche on November 10, 1938.

No Chief of State was so deeply mourned by his people; everyone, grown men, youths and children, wept at his funeral. He was adored, deified. He remains always the immortal Chief of the Turks. To conserve and complete his work he happily left behind capable and energetic companions. His successor as President of the Republic, General Ismet İnönü, was his valiant comrade on the battlefield and his Prime Minister for more than twelve years. Ismet was born in the city of Smyrna in 1884. His father, Rashid Bey, of a well-known family, was an official—Chief of the Law Department.

Ismet was a brilliant pupil of the Military School of Artillery, and of the Staff classes of that arm. He began his military career with the rank of Staff Captain in the Second Army, which then had its headquarters at Adrianople (1906).

His brilliant qualities of intelligence, energy and character always commanded confidence and esteem; his military and political career is made up of a succession of fortunate steps, of which these are the principal:

(i.) After the proclamation of the Constitution in 1908, Commandant Ismet Bey rendered great service in the suppression of the revolts in the Yemen.

(ii.) After the Balkan War of 1912, Ismet was entrusted with an important mission in the capacity of Military Counsellor during the negotiations for peace with the Bulgarians.

(iii.) During the Great War he was successively Chief of the "Premier Bureau" at Headquarters, Chief of Staff to the Second Army and Commandant of the 4th, 20th, and 3rd Army Corps. (He became Colonel in 1915.)

(iv.) At the Armistice Ismet Bey was appointed Under-Secretary of State to the War Minister. When, in May 1919, Kemal was preparing to go to Anatolia as Inspector of the Third Army, the future national hero consulted the young Colonel Ismet and revealed to him his secret plans.

It was not long before Ismet rejoined Atatürk in Ankara, which he reached in March 1920. Colonel Ismet was elected deputy after the re-assembling of the National Assembly and was appointed Chief of Staff to the Army, and then began the valuable participation of the future President of the Republic in the bloody and epic struggle organized by Kemal in order to restore the honour and independence of his country. Ismet was promoted General after the first victory over the Greeks at İnönü in 1921; and in April of that year he gained a still more important victory known as the second victory of İnönü. In memory of these two battles Kemal Atatürk bestowed on him the surname "Inönü."

After the great victories of Sakarya, of Afyon, of Dumlu Pinar, and finally the crushing defeat of the enemy at the gates of Smyrna, Ismet received the congratulations of the Grand National Assembly and was promoted to be General of Division in August 1922.

Besides being a valiant soldier on the field of battle, Ismet Pasha showed himself a shrewd and clever diplomatist during the negotiations for an armistice at Mudania and especially at the Peace Conference at Lausanne. Appointed Prime Minister in 1923, he held the post almost without interruption, and so, by the side of Atatürk, he became the principal founder of the New Turkey.

The Turkish nation, at a tragic turning-point of its history, had the good fortune to find its saviour in Kemal Atatürk and is now once again favoured by fate in the person of Ismet İnönü.

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

By C. A. F. DUNDAS, O.B.E.

(The author has recently returned after spending five years in the Middle East, during which time he has had occasion to travel extensively in this area.)

Since the last war almost every country in the Middle East has altered its form of government. Egypt from a British protectorate has become a sovereign State. Palestine and Transjordan, Syria and the Lebanon, and Iraq were all within the Turkish Empire; they are now sovereign States or mandated territory. Turkey, although not within the scope of this article, has become a highly organized republic under a régime in which there is only one recognized party; her modernization and return to importance in world affairs has made her the envy of most of the Middle Eastern nations.

During the twenty-one years from 1918-1939 each of these countries has been the scene of internal struggles which I believe have arisen more from an attempt to Westernize themselves than from external political causes. Unfortunately, British influence has been represented by five entirely separate Government Services. In Egypt, Iraq and Saudi Arabia members of the Diplomatic Corps have been the official representatives of Great Britain, in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, the Sudan Government Service, in Palestine, Aden and the Yemen, the Colonial Service, while in Syria and the Lebanon the Consular Service was our only representation, and in the Persian Gulf the Indian Political Service. Until very recently, when the Diplomatic and Consular Services were combined, these five Services were water-tight compartments with no direct contact with each other, with almost no opportunities for transfer from one to the other. This was a great pity, for, with the exception of the Sudan Political Service, numbering about 150 men, the posts available in these Middle East countries were so few for any one Service that there was no opportunity for a career in the Middle East in any one of them. British representatives therefore were, with a few notable exceptions, men without experience of problems peculiar to the Middle East, and in certain instances there were men with exceptional and profound knowledge unable to be used in key posts because the vacancy had to be filled by someone from another Service. It is sincerely to be hoped that after the war some free interchange of personnel between these five Services can be arranged. The fusion of the Consular and Diplomatic Services is a step in the right direction, but there is an overwhelming case to be made out for free interchange of British staff in all Arabic-speaking countries. I believe that in 1936 a suggestion was made that the Sudan Government Service should carry ten men in excess of the country's establishment to allow for secondment to other countries. Unfortunately, the plan was turned down, but, nevertheless, since the outbreak of war members of the Sudan Service have held the senior administrative posts in Abyssinia, Eritrea, Madagascar, Tripoli and Cyrenaica.

The impossibility of arranging for men experienced in the difficulties peculiar to Arab politics has greatly increased Great Britain's difficulties in the Arab area. In Egypt, the greatest centre of Europeanization and Moslem learning, there has been a steady progress towards freedom from foreign control. The brunt of Egyptian nationalist feeling has naturally been directed against Great Britain—the protecting Power at the end of the last war—though there is no doubt that other countries, particularly those with considerable commercial interests, such as France and Belgium, have aroused Egyptian hostility. With the expulsion in 1926 of the majority of Englishmen from Egyptian Government Service, Great Britain was left with the Diplomatic Corps and commercial firms as almost her only source of contact with Egyptians. The big business houses were resented by Egyptians as making profits which ought to be made by Egyptians, and the Diplomatic Corps was handicapped,

as I have mentioned above, by an inability to make use of the services of many of the people most suited for work in Egypt. In addition, the staff of an embassy has to deal almost exclusively with the personalities in power at the moment. In countries such as Egypt and Iraq, where ministries rise and fall with bewildering rapidity, and where all the holders of senior posts in the countries' administration are changed with every new ministry, it is extremely difficult for members of the Diplomatic Corps to gain the confidence and respect of officials with whom they are in contact. A minister or an under-secretary may be a regular visitor to the embassy or to the houses of members of the Diplomatic Corps, but when a change of Government takes place he will find that any personal contact which has been established with him will be put into cold storage until he returns to a post of influence.

The history of Palestine in the last twenty years is too well known to require retelling. While armed resistance to the British ceased within a few weeks of the outbreak of war, there has been no further official statement of British policy since the 1938 White Paper. There remain, therefore, all the old ingredients for trouble, and, in addition, both Arabs and Jews consider that the assistance they have given to the Allies during the past three years entitles them to special consideration after the war. One permanent complaint of the Arabs is that the Jews in Palestine have the ear of the House of Parliament, and that if ever they have a grievance it will be voiced in Parliament within twenty-four hours. The Arabs themselves hesitate to give publicity to their own case on the grounds that by arguing it they admit that their case is arguable. An interesting sidelight on this question of Arab and Jewish publicity came to my ears last summer when I was talking to an American Air Force colonel. He remarked in all good faith that his men had been greatly surprised during the three weeks they had spent in Palestine, for they had understood in America that the country belonged to the Jews, and now they were finding that Palestine was full of Arabs.

In Syria and the Lebanon under the French Mandate political unrest was never absent. The French Mandate was unpopular, and the institution of French monopolies in almost all profitable forms of commerce and public utilities gave the Syrians and Lebanese plenty of opportunities for expressing the view that their country was being exploited. The failure to implement the agreement made some two years before the war for the creation of two autonomous republics added to the dislike and distrust of the mandatory Power.

In Iraq—perhaps the most artificial of all Middle East countries in that in 1920 it represented nothing more than lines drawn on a map—King Feisal started at once to do his best to build up a nationalist outlook. This was done largely at the expense of the British. In the schools and in newspapers it was made clear to the Iraqis that the Allied campaign in the Middle East had been brought to a successful conclusion only by the co-operation and magnificent fighting qualities of the Arab armies. Iraq had become a nation as a result of the bravery, virility and wisdom of Iraqis. The British had tried to delay and prevent the independence of Iraq, but the British were incapable of doing so, though they were ready to go to any lengths to hinder Iraqi progress.

For twenty years, therefore, up to the outbreak of war, relations between Great Britain and Egypt, Palestine and Iraq had been thoroughly bad. In Syria and the Lebanon ill-feeling was largely turned against the French, but the British came in for a good deal as representing the neighbouring mandatory Power. For eight years German and Italian propaganda had done everything possible to increase and inflame these feelings of distrust, dislike and, at times, hatred of everything British. Money appeared to be no object to the Axis Powers, who paid particular attention to the Press, political malcontents and the younger generation in the army and Government services, students and schoolboys. This younger element represented a section of the community with which British officials were hardly ever in touch. The posts they held were not of sufficient importance to bring them into direct contact with the staffs of our embassies or in Palestine with senior Government officials. A very large number of them were dissatisfied with the conditions of their country, and were genuinely desirous of seeing their country developed politically, socially and economically. They felt keenly that the British were supporting the older politicians. These

older politicians represented to the young people of the Middle East a body of men who were successful and wealthy and desired no further change for fear that they should lose their power and wealth. The British therefore were blamed for retarding progress, for if the British did not support the older politicians, the younger generation would turn them out. With very few exceptions, no attempt was made by British officials in the Middle East to understand or to encourage the rising generation.

In 1938 the British Council, with the approval of the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office, began its policy of founding institutes throughout the Middle East. In these institutes a direct attempt is being made to secure contact with the young men and women from amongst whom the future leaders of the countries will be drawn. No attempt is made to force British ideas or points of view upon the members of the institutes. It is, however, possible for those who are interested to find libraries and reading-rooms, to attend courses on a variety of subjects, to hear lectures and to meet British people with a common interest—a common interest in the books or lectures or films which the institutes provide. For almost the first time, therefore, it is possible for Arabs to meet British people not as "the District Commissioner" or "the Bank Manager," but as Mr. X or Mr. Y, a human being, not an official. The response to these institutes has been amazing, and the only criticism I have ever heard from the local inhabitants is that they should have been started twenty years ago.

When the war started the British were faced in the Middle East with a potentially hostile population, convinced almost to a man that the British were incapable of defeating Germany. Despite this fact, armed resistance in Palestine ceased within a few weeks and Egypt and Iraq stood by their Treaty obligations to Great Britain. With the exception of the short Rashid Ali rising in the summer of 1941, there has been an almost complete absence of civilian trouble in all the Middle East countries. Large numbers of Palestinians, both Arabs and Jews, have been recruited for service with the British forces. In Egypt the Egyptians have been responsible for internal security, the guarding of internal communications and much of the working of the transport services. In July of last year there were many leading people throughout the Middle East who continued publicly to commit themselves to the British, although they fully anticipated an Axis occupation within a few days or weeks. Many requirements of our armies have been provided locally, and, with the one exception already mentioned, I know of no case where British troops have had to spend their time in counteracting the hostility of the local inhabitants. To quote one example, Nablus, the capital of Samaria—a district which for hundreds of years has been noted for violence—is now without a military garrison for the first time since B.C. 53.

After the war there is the possibility of a return to pre-war conditions of distrust and hatred, but the present situation offers an opportunity for a fresh beginning. Provided Great Britain makes it clear in her dealings with the Middle East that her desire is to assist in every way the development of these countries, I believe that the British will be welcomed as guides to lead the Middle East forward towards a civilization which the people of the Middle East are determined to create. They do not want European civilization, but they mean to emerge from their present condition into something more modern and creative. If we are prepared to give a lead in this advance, I believe that we shall find that our lead is welcomed, but to undertake this task successfully we must have suitable representatives in the countries concerned, and we must not neglect to give encouragement and support to all those, whatever their age or position, who genuinely desire to improve the condition of their countries.

FRENCH COLONIES IN 1943

BY B. S. TOWNROE

THE formation of the National Liberation Committee of France in Algiers will have far-reaching consequences both West and East. By far the greater part of the French Colonial Empire, from the islands in the Pacific to St. Pierre and Miquelon in the North Atlantic, are now under one leadership and are ranged on the side of the Allies. To the bitter disappointment of the "collaborators" the Vichy Government has totally failed to hold the French Empire, which has passed for the time under the control of such French patriots as General Giraud, General de Gaulle, M. Massigli, General Catroux, M. Monnet and M. Pleven.

With the exception of Indo-China, now under Japanese administration, and Martinique, and other small islands, which, by the time the next issue of the *ASiATIC Review* is in the hands of its readers, may have voluntarily come under the administration of the Committee in Algiers, all the rich colonies of France are anti-Axis.

The actual and potential resources of Algeria, Morocco, Tunis, Dahomey, the Ivory Coast, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, and other territories are now being used to bring about the unconditional surrender of Germany, Italy and Japan, who humiliated France in the days of her defeat.

In peace-time France brought to her colonial peoples the benefits and culture of the Latin civilization. These peoples of varying colour and creed are showing a loyalty to the traditions of freedom and independence, and have responded magnificently to the inspiring lead set three years ago by the handful of men who resolved in Britain's darkest hour to continue resistance.

As long ago as October 27, 1940, General de Gaulle established an Imperial Defence Council to administer French Equatorial Africa, and those Colonies in India and in the Pacific which had rallied to the appeal to continue the fight. In December, 1940, Mr. Churchill, who from the first had appreciated the contribution which these Free French territories with a population of over seven millions could bring to the struggle against the common enemies, officially recognized the Council. The French National Committee was formed nine months later.

By a letter dated September 26, 1941, the British Foreign Secretary recognized this Committee as responsible for all questions relating to the French overseas territories which accepted its authority. In 1942 the Government of the United States agreed to co-operate with General de Gaulle and the French National Committee in London on matters relating to the French island possessions in New Caledonia and the Pacific, the French territories in Equatorial Africa and the French Cameroons.

With the setting up of a French Central Committee in Algiers, having authority over all French territories freed from the enemy, and over all French forces, another step has been made—in the words of Mr. Macmillan—"in the rebirth of a nation." General Catroux, a brilliant negotiator, who now sits on the Algiers Committee as Commissioner for Muslim Affairs, recently told the bearded Kahyles from the mountains of the Atlas and the Arabs of the towns of the "restoration and renewal of the French Empire."

Since 1940 there has been a growing industrialization of French North Africa, due mainly to the inability of France to supply those territories with the manufactured good for which she was formerly their chief source. For example, there have been set up oil factories; paper factories and distilleries on the Ivory Coast; and textile factories using Algerian wool, distilleries, jam-making and fruit drying factories and soap factories in Algeria. Several large textile factories have been built in Tunisia and equipped with machinery bought from France. Much progress has been made in Morocco, where there are new match factories; producers of copper sulphate for the North African vineyards; oil refineries; boot and shoe factories; and a number of new factories for freezing and preserving foodstuffs, and for salting and drying fish. This wave of industrialization from Tunis to Dakar will affect the industrial balance between Europe and Africa in post-war years.

In Asia there are the possessions of French India with its four principal cities—

Pondichéry, Karikal, Mahe, and Changernagor. These Asiatic Colonies of France produce cotton, rice, tobacco, peanuts, hides, embroidery and wrought silver. The French Colonies of Oceania, New Caledonia, the New Hebrides (which is a French-British condominium), Noumea, Tahiti, Marquesas, and Gambier, are of vital importance owing to their position on the America-Australia route. They constitute air and naval bases of the greatest strategic value.

In short, the setting up of the National Liberation Committee in North Africa has opened a new chapter in French history. The formation of this Committee with its collective responsibility supersedes the situation created by the correspondence between Mr. Churchill and General de Gaulle in 1940. It brings the French Empire, the second largest in area, and the third in population in the world, into the war.

At the time of writing no announcement has been made as to the degree of recognition to be given to this Committee as representative of France. It has, however, been universally welcomed as the single and sole authority for all Frenchmen seeking to free Metropolitan France and the French Colonial Empire from the German yoke.

A SUMMER HOLIDAY IN TURKEY IN 1942

By F. L. BILLOWS

II. TREBIZOND TO ANKARA (*Continued*)

We hunted out the station master—a young man with large, round spectacles—who advised us to take four first-class tickets and so ensure a first-class compartment for ourselves and the elderly American naval officer who was travelling with us. As this would cost us far more than three second-class sleepers we were not very ready to do it, but eventually agreed, as it would enable us all to lie full length, my wife and the child on one seat, the American on the other, and myself on the floor. We could sit upright in a crowded Turkish second-class compartment for one night, but for two nights with a small child and an exasperated old man, both already tired and fractious from a long day in a heaving bus, we couldn't face it: we paid up, and the station master promised personally to find a compartment for us when the train came in. He didn't, but he told the train crew that some rich English and American people were getting on the train, and before we knew where we were I and half our luggage were in one compartment and my wife and the other half were in another at the end of the train; two rival ticket-clippers had us in thrall. My ticket-clipper told me that he had put me in my compartment because the one my wife was in would be unhitched at Cetinkaya, the junction for Malataya; my wife's ticket-clipper told her the exact contrary; but eventually the train policeman, seeing we preferred my wife's compartment—as it was next to the restaurant car—sided with him, and I ordered the luggage to be moved to my wife's compartment by the resident porter on the train. It wasn't so simple as that, though; my ticket-clipper positively forbade the porter to touch my luggage; he had reserved the compartment for me; others had been kept out for me, and I must have it. I had had enough of him and began to manhandle the luggage myself; the porter helped, and soon all was transferred, but a violent quarrel developed between the two ticket-clippers, ours supported by the policeman, which for all I know is going on still, for it rumbled up and down the train like distant thunder long after we had become detached from it. The policeman had his reward for being intelligent enough to side with the right ticket-clipper, for he came in to ask if our luggage was all transferred and everything all right, finishing up when I didn't respond quickly by telling me my Turkish was very good; with this last piece of shamelessness he made it evident that a gift of money would not be resented. Our new ticket-clipper was even more attentive, and kept putting his head round the door to ask if we were quite comfortable every ten minutes until I quenched his solicitude with a tip. The coach was not detached at Cetinkaya.

Under a full moon and a clear star-lit sky, we cantered briskly down a valley almost as brightly lit as when we first looked down on to it from the Kop, with black and indigo as the principal colours in place of brown and yellow; we rumbled across the river, swishing by with pale gleams and impatient rustling, not much bigger than the Çoruh but with a broader, boulder-strewn bed. We stopped occasionally at wayside stations, with a small, neat, stone-built ticket-hall-waiting-room and a paraffin lamp hoisted on a pole to illuminate the name on the side of the building; there was usually a station master, neatly accoutred in dark blue uniform, with a satellite yokel—trousers narrow round the shins and baggy at the seat—but there was rarely, apart from the station, more than a shack near the line; the whole district is very thinly populated.

I spread out my valise on the floor and began to sleep, but was soon on the move again, scratching and searching for the bugs that had woke me. I caught three or four. This time I got properly asleep before the survivors renewed the attack, but woke early in a pitiable condition. It was barely light; lights were still burning in the station we were just leaving; it was Erzincan, the centre of the severe earthquake two and a half years ago. There is nothing left of the former town but rubble; the Government has built a new town of temporary huts on the northern slopes of the valley at a short distance from the ruins. The mountains round the valley at this point are fairly high, and the valley seems to end in a wall of rock, but river and railway sweep round to the left and plunge into a sort of billiard-table pocket in the south-east corner of the Erzincan bowl; they seem to wriggle their way familiarly into the bosom of a range of mountains that edges aloofly back as the glossy black and dark grey intruder noses its way amongst them. A delicate veining in the lower part of the indigo sky to the south-east had developed under the growing light as on a photographic plate into pale grey mountains—standing out clearer and clearer as the sky behind them faded to blue—clean-cut and etched with lavender-coloured hair-lines of an incomparable delicacy. High and withdrawn, refined and exalted, austere and massive, these mountains hacked the yellower, lower mountains we were burrowing through like a weevil through cheese. From now on we were in a precipitous gorge filled by the river, and except for minor breaks when the mountains stood back a little from the river we were threading rocky gorges throughout the morning.

About seven o'clock we stopped at Kemah, a sun-baked, dusty town shut in by yellow rock; but at this time in the morning it was still fresh and dewy, and apparently it was fruitful, for people had come down to the train with baskets of fruit, and I was able to buy my first grapes of the season, deliciously sweet and firm, and I woke the others to share them.

The astonishing grandeur of the rock walls of the Upper Euphrates gorge kept us darting from one side of the compartment to the other. In some places a whole mountain had been split from the top nearly down to the river level, making a fissure hundreds of feet deep but only a few yards wide; in other places masses of rock split off from the side of the gorge made huge screens and pillars between us and the river; the colour of the rock was always changing—from cheese to biscuit colour, from buff to orange, from pale grey to slate, from green to light red and pink. Our American commander said he had not seen the Grand Canyon in America, but he had travelled in almost every other part of the mountains of North America, even in the Andes, without ever having seen anything to equal this. The gorge continues westward, from where the Euphrates turns south, as a channel for a tributary, the Calti Suyu; the line ascends this, past an iron-mining town called Divrik, with long piles of red-brown iron ore beside its extensive sidings and a castle on a rock behind it, to guard the entrance to the gorge, and on into another gorge after a few miles of open country. After a long wait in the afternoon heat for the Malataya train from the south to join ours at Cetinkaya, centre of a rich corn-growing district, we followed the stream right to its source in high, open country, like the Yorkshire moors on a larger scale. The ascent to this pass was very gradual, and one hardly realized one was at a considerable height even after seeing the board with 1,930 metres on it, until one came out on to the edge and saw the drop ahead and the corkscrew twirls of the line. Cylindrical concrete tunnels on the skyline were hard to understand at first, until someone explained that snow blows unhindered over these

open slopes in winter and accumulates over the railway track in huge drifts. Last winter a train got held up for a week or more, and people who couldn't get to the nearest village starved to death. It was hard to imagine this in the heat of summer, but it looked barren enough for anything. We came into Sivas from the south in the early evening and stopped there for some time. There are some large engineering shops there—including the chief railway repair shops—and a neat new suburb; but the old town is a mound of dusty mud huts of very unpalatable aspect. When we left it was already getting dark, and the route thereafter was the same as our outward journey.

I woke at Kayseri at about one in the morning; after leaving it, the view of the Erciyas Dagi (mountain), black and vast in the bright moonlight, with its smaller satellites grouped round it, was one of the most striking sights of our journey. It is remarkable that one of the highest mountains—Mount Ararat is the highest at 5,172 metres—in Turkey, a mountainous country, should rise to 3,916 metres straight out of a flat plain just outside Kayseri, which is only 1,043 metres. Of course it is a volcano, a very cleanly shaped cone. Sometimes, from the flatness given by moonlight, the group looked like a very jaggedly cut dado—or was it the perfect rendering in nature of bungling amateur imitations in black lacquer of Fujiyama? It was something very wonderful and fresh that seemed as if it ought to have been very stale and dusty, such as part of the decoration of a Victorian room. We steamed on through the night and reached Ankara at three o'clock in the afternoon, in time for three or four more weeks of summer though no more intolerable heat—after our foretaste of autumn in Trebizond.

So we completed a journey of over 1,500 miles, through out-of-the-way parts of Turkey that few English people and not many Turks ever visit. We had caught a glimpse of the real conservative Turkey which a few enthusiasts have been trying to change into a modern state overnight, of the essentially Muslim character of people in a country where Allah is sometimes alleged to have been dethroned. We were the first British Council people to make the journey over the Transit Road from Trebizond to Askale and over the stretch of railway between Askale and Sivas, and as the area has now been declared a prohibited zone for foreigners we shall probably be also the last for some time. We saw some astounding scenery and met some interesting people; above all, we got a much deeper insight into the character of the people in general and their ways of thought. Besides this, it was a practical expression of our interest in getting to know Turkey and the Turks, which is already bearing fruit in increased goodwill from our Turkish acquaintances in Ankara.

(*To be concluded.*)

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCHES ON ANCIENT INDIAN COLONIZATION IN MALAYA.
By H. G. Quaritch Wales. (*Malayan Branch Royal Asiatic Society Journal*, Vol. XVIII., Part I., 1940. Pp. 63. Pes. 89.)

(*Reviewed by DR. STELLA KRAMRISCH.*)

Dr. Quaritch Wales gives a detailed account of his explorations and excavations in Malaya, which are the basis of his important historical conclusions about the Indian colonization of Malaya and the site of the capital of the *Sailendra* empire.

Malaya owed her importance to her geographical position; she bordered the Straits of Malacca, the main sea trade route between the West and China, and her north-west coast provided the first sight of land to would-be Indian colonists after their crossing of the Bay of Bengal.

The researches were conducted in Kedah, Perak and Johore. Kedah yielded 29 sites, where the walls of Buddhist and Hindu (mainly *Siva*) sanctuaries and royal audience halls or council chambers were unearthed.

Though only the lower stone courses of the walls, laterite basements or plinths of moulded brickwork (site 10) were found, it is obvious that the superstructure of the buildings was of timber. Granite socles with mortises for the wooden pillars which supported the roof remained *in situ* in most of the sites. In one instance (site 14) an iron ring is preserved which must have strengthened the base of the pillar.

Sites 4 to 7 have the most ancient Siva shrines; they are assigned to the sixth and seventh centuries. Further Hindu shrines of the seventh to ninth centuries were unearthed in sites 8 to 10.

Site 1 is Buddhist; the stūpa has disappeared from its laterite basement, but a stone inscribed with the Buddhist "credo" assigns the building to the fourth century; site 3 has also the basement of a small stūpa, and the most important find there is a sun-dried clay tablet with three stanzas of the "Sāgaramatiपरिप्रच्छा" of the early sixth century. Site 13 has also a Buddhist shrine, and a palace of the eighth to ninth century. Figs. 4 to 15 give site and ground plans of the several buildings; the square sanctuary frequently contains the "snāpa-droni," and in addition to it there is sometimes the rectangular platform of the "mandapa."

A miniature bronze shrine roof assigned to the sixth or seventh century and found in site 4 conveys an idea about the superstructure, now invariably perished, of some of these buildings. The author rightly compares it with the roof of the monolithic Bhima and Janeśa rathas in Mahābālipuram. It should not be overlooked, however, that the arch of the roof is round in the Kedah bronze, whereas it is pointed in Mahābālipuram; and the "flower-pot" finial on the ridge of the roof is not likely to have served as a stone lamp. Other finds of considerable interest are nine-chambered reliquaries, discovered in site 8. Similar reliquaries are known from Java. The Kedah discoveries, according to Dr. Quaritch Wales, indicate the Indian origin of the Javanese ritual, although Indian sources of information on the subject are lacking.

Perak and Johore were not equally rich in excavation results, but finds made previously lead the author to some of his most far-reaching conclusions.

The Roman beads found at Johore were carried by Indian merchants from South India in the first to third centuries A.D. This first wave of Indian arrivals in Malaya was followed by a second wave, *circa* 300-550 A.D., and which brought about the Buddhist settlement in the Kinta valley, Perak. Reinforcements of newcomers arrived from South India *circa* 550-750 A.D., and these Hindu Pallava settlers are considered the third wave of Indian colonization.

In the second half of the eighth century the capital was moved from Kedah to Perak, and Hindu Pallava influence ceases at Kedah. Siva shrines are now superseded by Mahāyānist temples; they are a product of the fourth wave of Indian colonization. The fourth wave originated partly from South India and partly from the Pāla kingdom of Bengal. All the four waves came directly from the Indian motherland, and are not due to any reflux of cultural elements from Java or Sumatra.

The geographical position of the Kinta valley—where Buddhist images of the second and fourth waves of settlement were found—makes it probable that it was the site of the capital of the Sailendra empire. Dr. Quaritch Wales considers Kadāram in the Kinta valley—and not Sumatran Śrivijaya—to have been the capital of the Sailendra empire.

KHAKI AND GOWN. An Autobiography by Field-Marshal Lord Birdwood. (*Ward, Lock and Co., Ltd.*)

(Reviewed by EDWIN HAWARD.)

A man who served on the staff of Lord Roberts and was recommended by that great soldier for the staff of Lord Kitchener, and himself has subsequently trodden

the same paths as his commanders, could not but have a vividly variegated story to tell.

Whatever Lord Birdwood has done has been efficiently done, and few men have covered so much ground in the army and outside. Throughout this narrative, the modesty of the Senior Field-marshal—for that is what he is today—is matched only by his generous appreciation of the good qualities of all around him. In the course of these 400-odd pages there is no trace of malice, and even when criticism cannot be avoided, it is so diffidently and pleasantly worded that all possibility of giving pain is eliminated.

In particular, the book throws a new light on Lord Kitchener, and helps to dissipate some familiar delusions regarding that great soldier. Lord Birdwood makes no secret of his own conviction that the popular estimate of Kitchener's outstanding qualities was, for once, correct, and he gives no sort of encouragement to those who would put forward the theory that Kitchener's military reputation rested on an unsound legend. Kitchener became a legend, but his foresight was an enormous asset in the last war, just as his personality and driving power enabled those wonderful Kitchener battalions to spring out of the English soil and complete so effectively the work begun by the famous Contemptibles.

As for Lord Birdwood himself, his record in France, in Gallipoli and (after the war) in India, which is rivalled in his affection only by Australia, speaks for itself. Nor was he less happy when the khaki was doffed and the gown of the university ruler had to be donned. Today, still on the active list, as all Field-Marshal are, Lord Birdwood is able to give his countrymen, from his rich store of experience, valuable counsel and guidance.

This autobiography enshrines the thoughts of the last of the great Indian soldiers of the pre-1939 era. It shows clearly the stock from which the Indian Army officer has sprung, and, incidentally, explains how it is that in the present war so many men of the new vintage but the old traditions are coming to the fore.

THE BOOK OF MENCIUS. (Abridged.) Translated from the Chinese by Lionel Giles.
(*Wisdom of the East Series.*) London, 1942. 3s. 6d. net.

(Reviewed by PROFESSOR A. C. MOULE.)

This is a most welcome and important addition to the Wisdom of the East Series, and it is indeed surprising that we have had to wait so long for the wisdom of one who ranks as high as Mencius justly does among the early thinkers and teachers of China. The translation is preceded by a valuable introduction of 11 pages, giving a clear idea of the man and of his teaching, and emphasizing his strange and unfortunate demand to be treated with proper respect by the great and his very genuine concern for the welfare of the common people. The translation is described as abridged, but less than half of the original has been left out, and the omissions are almost always the less important whole chapters, so that what remains gives completely not only the matter of the original but also its actual phraseology and manner. As there is little or no systematic arrangement in the original, this full quotation of the important chapters and complete omission of the rest is very much better than a dry summary of the thought and sense of the whole book would have been.

That the translation is well done is guaranteed by Dr. Giles's name, and his English style is enviably easy and clear, a very pleasant contrast to the quaint language of his giant predecessor Legge. But a comparison of the two versions only shows how very little Legge has to learn from eighty years of subsequent British sinology, as far as the traditional and, as it were, authorized interpretation of Mencius is concerned. There are a very few obscurities, where we might have been glad of more light, as, for instance, on page 34: "The ruler of a state promotes men of worth only when he needs must." Mencius cannot have meant to say that the ruler does not promote good men if it can be avoided, but rather that he necessarily and always promotes them till it seems as if he were compelled to do so by some irresistible force.

The book is packed with thoughts which are beautiful and valuable in themselves, and often curiously appropriate to these sad days.

THE WAY, THE TRUTH, THE LIFE

In legends of ancient Han,
 It is written of mighty Lao-Tzu,
 The Teacher of the Way,
 That, despairing of his mission,
 He mounted his dun cow,
 The Cow that jumped the moon !
 And came so to the Gate
 That leads into the desert.

But the guardian of the Gate
 Forbore to let him pass,
 Taking the Tao-Tê with him;
 For China in those days
 Put a high price on Wisdom.

Therefore the patient Sage
 Forthwith spent one whole night
 Of ceaseless vigilance.
 And when the morning bell
 Released him on his way,
 Yin-Hsi, the Keeper of the Gate,
 Clasped to his warlike breastplate
 Lao-Tzu's jade book of Wisdom,
 The world-famed Tao-Tê-King !

JOHN KAVANAGH.

WANTED

Copies of ASIATIC REVIEW, Vol. 38, No. 135, July, 1942.

Edw. G. Allen and Son,
 12, Grape Street, W.C. 2.

CORRESPONDENCE

"FROM MANY ANGLES"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "ASIATIC REVIEW."

SIR,

In the review of the above book which appeared in your April issue I find it described as "the frankest exposure of Lord Irwin's Governor-Generalship that has yet been given." May I point out that on page 416, on the contrary, Sir Frederick Sykes says that Lord Willingdon's policy was the logical development of Irwinism, and quotes with approval the happy remark of *The Times* that Irwin broke the bowling and enabled Willingdon to hit boundaries? His criticisms were directed not at the policy of any individual Viceroy, but at the slow-moving and cumbrous machinery of the Government of India.

Reference might also have been made to the outstanding feature of Sir Frederick Sykes's Indian Governorship—the Bombay Village Improvement Scheme—which is the only comprehensive attempt that has hitherto been made in that Presidency to solve the problem of Indian poverty and indebtedness.

The reviewer passes over the salient points in the author's career in the Royal Flying Corps—his taking over the force to Amiens in August, 1914, his discovery of von Kluck's turning movement which all but cut off the B.E.F., his epoch-making try-out of the torpedo aircraft in the Dardanelles, his tenure of office as Chief of the Air Staff of the newly formed Royal Air Force, April, 1918-19, and his claim to be considered as the parent of the Bomber Command, as he initiated the Independent Air Force which helped to bring about the unexpected German collapse of November, 1918, by the havoc it caused in the Ruhr.

Yours faithfully,
H. G. RAWLINSON.

May 12, 1943.

The Reviewer writes:

As an impartial reviewer, one used the word *exposure* to convey its straightforward dictionary meaning—"act of laying bare or open"—and eschewed polemical comment or comparison, as one now declines to be led into either. My critic, moreover, incorrectly quotes the passage for which he takes me to task.

SIR,

On page 148 of the *ASIATIC REVIEW* for April, which has just reached me, there is an omission from my remarks which alters the sense. The fourth line from the end of the page should read: "for the superiority of the original slip system over the tick system which it replaced, as he had painful experience of the latter in 1891."

The passage was correctly reported in the *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* of March 5.

Yours truly,
E. A. GAIT.

May 16, 1943.

The views expressed in these pages must be taken as those of the individual contributors. THE ASIATIC REVIEW does not hold itself responsible for them.

BULLETIN OF THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE

A Quarterly Record of Progress relating to Agricultural, Mineral and other Industries, with Special Reference to the Utilisation of the Raw Materials of the Dominions, India and the Colonies.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS OF CURRENT ISSUE

VOL. XLI, No. 1, JANUARY-MARCH, 1943

SPECIAL NUMBER COMMEMORATING
THE JUBILEE OF THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE
1893-1943

Foreword. By Her Majesty Queen Mary.

Introduction. By Harcourt Johnstone, M.P.

Good-will messages to the Imperial Institute.

The Story of the Imperial Institute. By Sir Harry Lindsay.

Scientific and Technical Departments: Plant and Animal Products.
By S. E. Chandler, J. R. Furlong and H. J. Jeffery.

Scientific and Technical Departments: Mineral Resources. By
S. J. Johnstone, W. O. R. Wynne and G. E. Howling.

The Exhibition Galleries. By H. Spooner.

The Library. By F. H. nn.

Also Bibliographies on Agriculture, Forestry, Insecticide Materials of
Vegetable Origin, and Mineral Resources.

LONDON

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, SOUTH KENSINGTON, S.W. 7

Price 2s. 6d. by post 2s. 9d.

Annual Subscription, 10s. post free

EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION

Founded in 1888 to promote the welfare of the inhabitants of India.

WESTMINSTER CHAMBERS, 3, VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, S.W. 1.

President.

Major-General the Right Hon. Sir FREDERICK STEPHEN, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.,
G.C.B., K.C.B., C.M.G., M.P.

Vice-Presidents.

His Highness the Aga Khan, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.V.O., G.C.I.E.

His Highness the Maharaja Gaekwar of BARODA, G.C.I.E.

His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., C.V.O.

Field-Marshal Sir PHILIP CHETWODE, Bart., G.M., G.C.B., G.C.S.I., K.C.M.G., D.S.O.

The Most Hon. the Marquess of CREWE, P.C., K.G.

Lord ERKIN, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

The Right Hon. Viscount GOSCHEN, P.C., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., C.B.E.

His Highness the Maharaja of GONDAL, G.C.I.E.

His Highness the Maharaja Scindia of GWAHLOR, G.C.I.E.

Lord HAILEY, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E.

His Excellency the Right Hon. Viscount HALIFAX, P.C., K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

The Right Hon. Lord HARRISBURGH, P.C., K.C., G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E., G.C.V.O., I.S.O.

His Highness the Maharaja of INDORE, G.C.I.E.

Lieut.-General His Highness the Maharaja of JAMMU AND KASHMIR, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., K.C.V.O.

Colonel His Highness the Maharaja of JIND, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

Brigadier His Highness Raja-i-Rajaur, Maharaja of KAPURTHALA, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.B.E.

His Excellency the Most Hon. the Marquess of LINLITHGOW, P.C., K.T., G.M.S.I., G.M.I.E.

Colonel His Highness the Maharaja Jansahib of MAWARAGAR, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I.

His Highness the Maharajadhiraja of PATIALA, G.B.E.

MARIE Marchioness of WILLINGDON, C.I., G.B.E.

The Most Hon. the Marquess of ZETLAND, P.C., K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.

COUNCIL.

Chairman.—Sir JOHN A. WOODHEAD, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

Vice-Chairmen.

Sir ATUL CHANDRA CHATTERJEE, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I.

Sir THOMAS SMITH, V.D.

Sir WILLIAM BARTON, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

Lady BENTWELL, D.B.E.

Sir FRANK HERBERT BROWN, C.I.E.

Sir ALFRED CHATTERTON, C.I.E.

Sir LOUIS WILLIAM DANE, G.C.I.E., C.S.I.

PAVITRA KUMAR DUTT.

Sir HERBERT EMERSON, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., C.B.E.

Sir HARRY G. HASS, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

Lady HARTOG.

Sir ERNEST HOTSON, K.C.S.I., O.B.E.

SHAMALDHARI LALL, C.I.E., I.C.S.

Sir COURTHENAY LATIMER, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

Sir IDWAL GROFFEY LLOYD, C.S.I.

Sir ANDERSON MARTIN.

HUGH MOLSON, M.P.

Sir FRANK NOYCE, K.C.S.I., C.B.E.

The Dowager Marchioness of READING, D.B.E.

FREDERICK RICHTER, M.A.

Divya Bahader Sir SAMUEL R. RUNGARADHAN.

Sir HOPETOUN STOKES, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

Sir HASRAN SWARAWARDY, O.B.E.

Sir ALFRED H. WATSON.

Sir GILBERT WILDE, K.C.I.E., C.S.I.

Secretary.—Sir FRANK H. BROWN, C.I.E.

Associate Secretary.—H. G. KING.

Secretary.—MESSRS. GRINDLAY & CO., LTD., 34, PARLIAMENT STREET, S.W. 1.

Secretary.—

MAJOR DENTON HENRY BRAMALL, M.R.E., T.D. (of the firm of Messrs. T. L. Wilson & Co.).

Annual Subscription payable in advance, £1 1s. The Life Subscription is £14.

For Members joining after October 15, the first subscription will cover the ensuing calendar year.

Members receive the *Indian Review* each quarter, free, by post.

Other and important volumes are read and discussed at frequent intervals and members may contribute to the meetings. There are also occasional social gatherings.

